FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-103
Tuesday
1 June 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-103 CONTENTS *1 June 1993*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

Conference Opens at CIS Headquarters in Minsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 1
Shaposhnikov Suggests Security Mechanism *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 1
CIS High Command Rear Support Committee Formed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 May]* 2
Nazarbayev Expresses Concern During Foreign Trade Meeting *[ITAR-TASS]* 2
    Receives Economic Department Heads *[Almaty Radio]* 3
Industrial Agreements Adopted at Karaganda Conference *[Almaty Radio]* 3
Nazarbayev, Karimov, Akayev Sign Joint Declaration *[Almaty Radio]* 3
Shokhin Will Attend CCC Session in Minsk 1 Jun *[ITAR-TASS]* 3
ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 29 May 4
    Press Review for 1 Jun 4

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Black Sea Fleet Dispute Continues; Resolution Sought 6
    Navy Issues Statement *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
    Fleet Protests Ukraine's Unilateral Approach *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
    More Ships Hoist St. Andrew's Flags *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 29 May]* 6
    Yeltsin Ready for Talks With Kravchuk *[Radio Rossii]* 7
    Kozyrev Sent to Kiev To Resolve Issue *[Moscow TV]* 7
    Officers Send Message to Grachev *[ITAR-TASS]* 8
    Kasatonov Interviewed on Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 8
Baltic Fleet Commander on Speeding Up Redeployment *[Moscow TV]* 9
Spokesman on Five-Year Anniversary of Treaty With U.S. *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
Moscow Views Possible Resumption of U.S. Nuclear Tests *[Moscow International]* 9
Warships Visit New York; Vice Admiral Interviewed *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Moscow Welcomes Armenian, Azeri Consent to Peace Plan *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
Foreign Ministry Officials Meet Azerbaijani Diplomats *[ITAR-TASS]* 11
Bosnia Crisis Used To Raise Diplomatic Profile *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 11
Ministry 'Incompetence' Blamed for Snub to Portugal *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 11
Yeltsin Receives French Party Leader Chirac *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
Kozyrev Holds Talks With Visiting Finnish Counterpart 12
    Welcomes Finnish Foreign Minister *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
    Says Russia Ready for New Initiative on Bosnia *[ITAR-TASS]* 12
    Discusses European Issues *[Helsinki Radio]* 13
Shokhin Arrives in Copenhagen for Talks on EC Cooperation *[Moscow Radio]* 13
Shokhin Meets Leading Danish Officials *[ITAR-TASS]* 13
Shokhin Reports on Trade Talks in London *[Moscow TV]* 14
Shokhin Comments on Leaked Letter Scandal *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 28 May]* 14
Kozyrev Views Humanitarian Issues With UN Official *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
Yeltsin Again Asks Azerbaijan To Pardon Russian Soldiers *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
Kozyrev Discusses Abkhazia Peace Prospects With UN Envoy *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
Talks Held With Latvia; Agreements Reached 16
    Talks Previewed; Agreements Described *[Moscow TV]* 16
    First Round of Talks Ends; No Details *[Radio Rossii]* 16
    Pact on Military Personnel Transport Signed *[Riga Radio]* 16
No Agreement in Financial Settlements Talks With Moldova *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 28 May]* 17
Foreign Ministry Condemns Attack on Border Guards *[ITAR-TASS]* 17
Talks With Turkey Continue on Stability in Adjacent Regions *[ITAR-TASS]* 17
Japan's Saito Arrives in Moscow for Talks on Territories *[Tokyo KYODO]* 17
Japan's Miyazawa on Kuril Issue *[ITAR-TASS]* 18

- Radio Cites AFP on Phnom Penh Meeting on Cambodia *[Moscow International]* 18
- Komsomolsk To Exchange Su-27 Fighters for Meat With PRC *[Moscow TV]* 18
- Scientific, Technical Cooperation Discussed With ROK *[ITAR-TASS]* 18
- Moscow Comments on Yarov's Visit to Vietnam *[Moscow International]* 19
- Delegation Ends Visit to Vietnam; Cooperation Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 19
- Terms of Agreement with Cuba Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 19
- Agreement on Air Traffic Signed With Mexico *[ITAR-TASS]* 20

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Constitution Issues

- Further on Yeltsin Meeting With Regional Leaders 21
  - Council Statement Issued *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Congress Will Not Adopt Constitution *[Moscow TV]* 21
  - More on Yeltsin Speech *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 29 May]* 22
- Yeltsin Meets With Constitutional Court Members *[Russian TV]* 22
  - Judges Invited to Conference *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
  - Meeting Called 'Constructive' *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
- Kostikov Warns of Khasbulatov's 'Dangerous Tactic' *[ITAR-TASS]* 23
  - Trying To Prevent Constitution Adoption *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
- Meeting on Constitution Begins in St. Petersburg *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
  - Ryabov Addresses Conference *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
  - Participants Urge 'Resolute Measures' *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
  - Delegates Support Proposal for Conference *[Moscow International]* 25
  - Sobchak Addresses Conference *[ITAR-TASS]* 25
  - Conference Participants Interviewed *[Russian TV]* 26
- Filatov Outlines Constitutional Conference Procedures *[Moscow Radio]* 27
- Yeltsin Decree Increases Conference Participants *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
- Officials Urge Congress To Abandon Confrontation *[Russian TV]* 28
- Commission Prepares Amendments to Draft Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
- Abdulatipov Urges Consensus on Constitution *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 28
- Opposition Prepares for 3 Jun March *[MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS 28 May]* 31
- Muscovites Polled on Constitution-Related Issues *[KURANTY 29 May]* 32
- Communist Party Leaders Oppose Yeltsin's Constitution *[ITAR-TASS]* 32

Political Issues

- Rutskoy Deplores 'Campaign' Against Him *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 32
- Filatov: Rutskoy 'May Be Ousted' From Kremlin *[ITAR-TASS]* 34
- Khasbulatov Interviewed on Current Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 May]* 34
- Khasbulatov Warns of Russia's Disintegration *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 May]* 38
- Yeltsin Takes Over Pension Fund From Parliament *[ITAR-TASS]* 43
- More on 27 May Presidium Session on Privatization *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 28 May]* 43
- Federal Ministries Will Contain Regional Representatives *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
- Democratic Russia Aims for Pre-Election Coalition *[ITAR-TASS]* 44
- Yeltsin Supporters Plan To Convene New 'Russian Union' *[Moscow TV]* 44
- Social Democrats Join Centrist Coalition *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 28 May]* 44
- Zhirinovskiy Favors Presidential Rule *[FEDERATSIYA 29 May]* 45
- Former Official Denies Connection to Investigation *[ROSSIYA 26 May-1 Jun]* 46
- Procurator General's Office Protests Supreme Court Ruling *[ITAR-TASS]* 46
- Stepankov Interviewed on SCSE Trial *[Moscow TV]* 47
- Yeltsin Edict on Interim Provision on Rallies *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 27 May]* 48

Supreme Soviet

- Khasbulatov Speech to Soviets Forum Previewed *[IZVESTIYA 29 May]* 49
- Conference of People's Deputies Begins; Khasbulatov Speaks *[ITAR-TASS]* 50
  - Khasbulatov Attacks 'Corrupt Officials' *[Moscow Radio]* 51
  - Further on Khasbulatov Speech *[ITAR-TASS]* 51
  - Parliament Should 'Dissolve' Government *[Radio Rossii]* 52

  - Khasbulatov, Rutskoy, Pochinok Cited *[Russian TV]* 52
  - Khasbulatov Comments Summarized *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
- Legislators Agree To Deny Quorum to Congress *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
- Khasbulatov Opposes Speeding Up Constitution's Adoption *[ITAR-TASS]* 53
- Ryabov Says 'Split' in Parliament Leadership Growing *[ITAR-TASS]* 54
- Parliament Session Said To Discuss 'Top Leadership' *[ITAR-TASS]* 54
- Parliament Favors Single Draft of Basic Law *[Radio Rossii]* 55

Regional Affairs

- Further on Khasbulatov Visit to Samara, Saratov 55
  - Proposes Referendum on Constitutions *[Russian TV]* 55
  - Speaks to Oblast Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 55
  - More on Speech to Soviet *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 56
  - Tours Defense Enterprises *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
  - Begins Visit in Saratov *[Russian TV]* 57
  - Criticized by Saratov Workers *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
  - Meets Protestors, Deputies *[Moscow TV]* 57
  - Criticizes Government Industrial Policy *[Russian TV]* 58
  - Volga German Issue Viewed *[Russian TV]* 58
- N. Ossetia Seeks To Extend State of Emergency *[ITAR-TASS]* 58
- Officials Visit N. Ossetia, View Refugee Problems *[ITAR-TASS]* 59
- State of Emergency Declared in Ossetian, Ingush Regions *[ITAR-TASS]* 59
  - State of Emergency Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 59
  - Yerin Named Presidential Representative *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
  - Situation 'Relatively Calm' *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
  - N. Ossetia, Ingush Officials Meet *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
  - Situation in Emergency Zone 'Peaceful' *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
- ROSSISKAYA GAZETA Version of Khasbulatov Appeal *[28 May]* 61
- Chechen Court Terms Dudayev's Acts 'Criminal' *[Russian TV]* 62
- Chechen Court Demands Resignation of Officials *[Radio Rossii]* 62
- Chernomyrdin on Vacation in Sochi; Comments on Ruble *[Moscow Radio]* 62
  - Tours Krasnodar Kray *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
  - Meets Local Leaders *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
- Chernomyrdin in Novorossiysk To Discuss Port Project *[ITAR-TASS]* 63
  - Ukrainian Ports To Be Replaced *[ITAR-TASS]* 63
- Democratic Reforms Movement Conference Opens in Tver *[ITAR-TASS]* 63
  - Supports Constitutional Conference *[Moscow International]* 63
  - Further on Conference *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 1 Jun]* 64
- Regional Leaders Comment on Constitution *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 27 May]* 64

UKRAINE

International Affairs

- Government Sets Conditions on Nuclear Disarmament *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 29 May]* 66
- Decision on Nuclear Weapons To Be Decided After START I *[Kiev International]* 67
- Analyst Views Relations With United States *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 27 May]* 67
- Foreign Ministry Protests Over Black Sea Fleet *[ITAR-TASS]* 68
- Morozov Refuses To Pay Crews Flying 'Alien Flag' *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
- Kravchuk Interview Urges Meeting With Yeltsin *[Moscow TV]* 69
- Russian Envoy Delivers Yeltsin Letter to Kravchuk *[ITAR-TASS]* 70
- Kravchuk Talks to Brzezinski About Relations With Russia *[UKRINFORM]* 70
- Zlenko: Yugoslav Sanctions Disrupting Shipping on Danube *[Kiev International]* 71
  - Losses Over $2.3 Billion *[UNIAN]* 71
- Talks End With Russia on Gas Deliveries, Payments, Loans *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 28 May]* 71
  - Trade Accords Signed *[UNIAR]* 71
  - Kiev To Pay Back $2.5 Billion Loan *[UNIAN]* 72

National Affairs

Kravchuk Interviewed on Current Issues *[Kiev International]* 72
Kravchuk Comments on Reforms, Plans *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 27 May]* 75
Supreme Council Debates Draft Military Doctrine *[UNIAR]* 76
Industrialists Want Kuchma, Ministers To Manage Economy *[Kiev International]* 76
Pynzenyk Warns of Soaring Prices, Urges 'Strong Shock' *[ITAR-TASS]* 76

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Shushkevich Interviewed on Results of Romanian Visit *[ZVYAZDA 11 May]* 78
Article Views Arms Supply to Tajikistan *[ZVYAZDA 13 May]* 79
Trade, Economic Agreements Signed With Switzerland *[ITAR-TASS]* 79

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

U.S. Delegation Finds 'No Serious Violations' of START I *[ITAR-TASS]* 80
Foreign Minister Meets Danish Economic Minister *[Almaty Radio]* 80
Tereshchenko Tours West, Departs for Moscow 31 May *[Almaty Radio]* 80

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Comments on Russia's Role in Caucasian 'War' *[Tel Aviv DAVAR 28 May]* 81
Kamberov Notes Need To 'Win' U.S. Interest *[TURAN]* 82
Russian Airborne Division Leaves Gyandzha *[Baku TV]* 82
Russia Said Unable To Provide Credit *[Baku Radio]* 82

Georgia

Abkhazia, S. Ossetia Appeal to Yeltsin To Delay Treaty *[ITAR-TASS]* 82
    Shevardnadze Envoy Criticizes Appeal *[ITAR-TASS]* 83
Shevardnadze Issues Decree on Armed Forces *[CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]* 83
Shevardnadze, Officials Attend 'Mkhedrioni' Meeting *[Tbilisi Radio]* 83
    Shevardnadze Says Compromise Reached *[CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]* 83
Reports on Ukrainian Mercenaries Denied *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Abkhazia Denies Meeting With Karkarashvili *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Shevardnadze Receives Letter From Turkey's Demirel *[Tbilisi Radio]* 84

Conference Opens at CIS Headquarters in Minsk

LD2805153593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1505 GMT 28 May 93

[By BELINFORM correspondent Larisa Klyuchnikova for TASS]

[Text] Minsk May 28 TASS—The international conference "CIS: The State of And Prospects for Development" opened at the headquarters of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) in Minsk on Friday [28 May].

Belarussian Parliament Speaker Stanislav Shushkevich addressed the forum with a speech of greetings. He said that "there is no clear concept of building the CIS" and expressed hope that the current conference will work out recommendations on the Commonwealth's problems.

Shushkevich said that he does not support the idea of creating a Baltic-Black Sea union as an alternative to the CIS and again expresssed opposition to his republic's accession to a collective security treaty advocated by some CIS countries.

In his opinion, this "will not give an impetus to the development of the military-industrial complex in Western Europe".

The conference is attended by scholars from CIS countries as well as representatives from the U.N. temporary office in Belarus, the Interparliamentary Assembly and the CIS Executive Secretariat.

Shaposhnikov Suggests Security Mechanism

PM3105152193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 93 First Edition p 5

["Exclusive" interview with Marshal Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, by Viktor Litovkin; place and date not given: "Marshal Shaposhnikov Dissatisfied With Collective Security Treaty"]

[Text] The next meeting of the heads of the CIS states is scheduled for Yerevan. The presidents intend to discuss and adopt a new mechanism for implementing the Collective Security Treaty. In an exclusive interview for IZVESTIYA, Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces [JAF], now talks about the reasons for this decision.

The armed forces, the marshal said, have been traveling a fairly dramatic and difficult road which began back in December 1991 and continues to this day. It proved impossible to preserve their unity because of the rapid and painful disintegration of the unitary state. Nor have they really been transformed into joint armed forces.

The reasons for this are well known, Shaposhnikov noted. They are the processes of disintegration, the hasty adoption by the parliaments and other structures of some states of uncoordinated legislative acts on defense questions, and the ambitions of various leaders and military departments.

The Collective Security Treaty seemed to give rise to certain hopes. Even though it seemed too harsh to some, including the Russian parliament. The deputies have still not ratified it.

But the further disintegration of the defense sphere, Marshal Shaposhnikov said, could have irreparable and, most importantly, dangerous consequences not just for individual states of the CIS, but also for Russia itself despite its incomparably more significant defense potential.

Some leaders of the Russian parliament believe that Russia will survive somehow, even without such a treaty. Even though the lack of one means that it will be necessary to create a new Russian border along its entire perimeter as well as a new air defense system, ABM defense, and other vital elements of the defense infrastructure with all the attendant consequences.

And those consequences are—time and money. Neither of which Russia has enough of. What must be done to avoid this?

Shaposhnikov believes that the Russian leadership could put forward political initiatives and take energetic steps toward ensuring the maximum integration of the CIS countries' economies and defense.

Furthermore, he stressed, no one should be forced to enter into this association. Some simply are not ready for this. Economic and defense integration must be developed first and foremost with those states that actually want it.

I can see states like that, Shaposhnikov claimed. States like Russia, Kazakhstan, and the other states that signed the treaty and, to some extent, Belarus. I think that it is these states, which have common borders, a common history and common traditions, an approximately equally developed and closely interlinked industry, and which are at the same time least affected by nationalism which could embark on such integration. Russia, of course, could unite them.

From all viewpoints, the unification of these states in the sphere of the economy, foreign policy, and defense could be achieved with the least pain and most effectively, in the marshal's opinion. For this purpose, he proposes creating coordinating organs of those countries on an equitable and mutually acceptable democratic basis, organs which would be vested with concrete functional rights and obligations on the main questions of economic policy, foreign policy, and military activity. This is beneficial not just for domestic reasons, but also for external reasons.

What structures could they be?

First of all, a political superstructure in the form of the Collective Security Council. The main military-political organ in the community of those states which really want both collective security and Joint Armed Forces.

The Collective Security Council should include, in Marshal Shaposhnikov's view, the heads of the states and governments. In addition, it would include the chairmen of the Defense Ministers Council and the Foreign Ministers Council.

The Defense Ministers Council already exists, the Foreign Ministers Council does not, but it too must be created from the representatives of the states which have agreed to the defense alliance.

The working organ of the Collective Security Council could be a joint secretariat headed by a general (or executive) secretary. There is no need to be afraid of the term "general" secretary, Shaposhnikov believes. NATO has one, the United Nations has one, and no one would dream of making any associations with the communist party.

The general secretary, in his view, must be a civilian. A trained diplomat but one with a knowledge of military matters.

The marshal considers it advisable that the commander in chief of the JAF be appointed for a specific term, like the general secretary. For five years, let us say. He would be a civilian of one of the states and would not be a deputy defense minister or defense minister of any state. Furthermore, all the forces belonging to the collective security system would be under his operational jurisdiction. At the same time, operational and mobilizational plans, training programs, material, technical, and other types of backup, and military-technical policy must be common to the JAF and the armed forces of those states belonging to the collective security system.

The commander in chief of the JAF, Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov proposed, must simultaneously remain as the commander of the strategic nuclear forces until they are withdrawn from the territory of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine. For the purpose of ensuring the successful exercise of such functions it is expedient that the commander in chief of the Strategic Missile Forces, the Air Force, the Navy, and the Air Defense Forces of Russia and also the commander of the Military-Space Forces have the status of JAF deputy commanders in chief for strategic forces.

I want to say, Shaposhnikov stated, that, even today, Ukraine is not opposed to the idea that the strategic forces stationed on its territory be led by a commander in the form of the commander in chief of the JAF. The president and defense minister of Ukraine and I have had talks on this subject, he said. They agreed to this. Even when I explained to them, the marshal noted, that I do not have sufficient potential to ensure the normal functioning of their missile launchers and, therefore, I need Russian representatives for work in the missile troops stationed in Ukraine, there were no questions then either.

They said: "Yevgeniy Ivanovich, whenever the Russians need to come here just give us a call and we will give the go-ahead." That is why the Collective Security Council, its general secretary, and the commander in chief of the JAF are needed.

This is a good formula, Shaposhnikov said, and with its help the Collective Security Treaty can be made viable and many problems can be resolved.

CIS High Command Rear Support Committee Formed

PM3105090193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 May 93 p 3

[Report from CIS Joint Armed Forces High Command public information center: "At CIS Joint Armed Forces High Command Headquarters"]

[Text] The first session of the CIS Joint Armed Forces High Command rear support committee was held 26 May this year. Taking part were representatives of the central rear organs of the defense departments of nine states—Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. During the session there was a discussion of the basic principles of the material and technical backup for the groups of military observers and collective peacekeeping forces in the CIS. There was an exchange of opinions on ways of organizing collaboration between the rear staffs and services of the CIS states' armed forces.

At the session Major General Yu.A. Belikov, deputy chief of the Russian Federation Armed Forces rear staff, was elected chairman of the CIS Joint Armed Forces High Command rear support committee.

Nazarbayev Expresses Concern During Foreign Trade Meeting

LD3105173193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1608 GMT 31 May 93

[By KAZTAG correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Almaty May 31 TASS—Several decisions on general principles of tariff and non-tariff regulations and export control have been adopted today at the second session of the CIS Foreign Trade Ministers Council. The session started here on Monday [31 May] gathering representatives from Belarus, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. The council has also fixed regulations for identification of producers.

Addressing the ministers Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev expressed concern over the situation in the CIS where unqualified approach to business matters and poor co-ordinanation of governments' and ministries' activities create a lot of problems. According to Nazarbayev, many decisions adopted at the inter-state level have not been put into practice. New customs barriers often limit trade exchange. Corruption and bribery are still in question. All these problems demand urgent solution, the president stated.

Receives Economic Department Heads

LD0106085993 Almaty Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 2300 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] The second regular session of the Council of Leaders of Foreign Economic Departments of the CIS member-countries began in Almaty in the House of Friendship yesterday [31 May]. Representatives of Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Ukraine are participating in it. The participants of the session were received by President Nursultan Nazarbayev. He expressed his discontent with the situation on the CIS market as a nonprofessional approach to business and a lack of concerted action on the part of governments and departments, which create a number of problems. Many decisions adopted on the interstate level remain unimplemented. For instance, the documents concerning the interstate bank were signed but payments for the delivered goods have still not been made. In another example, Kazakhstan's CIS partners currently owe us 110 billion rubles. Sometimes customs offices open on the borders become barriers to trade exchange. Corruption and bribery have not been eradicated. All these issues demand urgent examination and expert decisionmaking.

Nursultan Nazarbayev wished the heads of Foreign Economic Departments success in their work and expressed hope that their session in Almaty will be very fruitful.

Industrial Agreements Adopted at Karaganda Conference

LD0106083493 Almaty Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 2300 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] A two-day conference of heads and plenipotentiary representatives of the governments of Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Ukraine on the problems of industry ended in Karaganda yesterday. Kazakhstan President Nursultan Nazarbayev spoke at the conference, and Prime Minister Sergey Tereshchenko signed an agreement on setting up an intergovernmental council on industry on behalf of Kazakhstan. The rules of the intergovernmental council on industry were adopted. An agreement on setting up an interstate joint stock Karatau company was signed with the participation of Kazakhstan, Russia, Uzbekistan and Ukraine. An interstate agreement in the sphere of machine-building was also adopted.

These documents will be presented for ratification to the Council of CIS Heads of State.

Nazarbayev, Karimov, Akayev Sign Joint Declaration

LD2905111293 Almaty Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 2300 GMT 28 May 93

[Excerpts] On the morning of 28 May, Presidents Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan and Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan arrived in Shymkent to participate in the festival devoted to the memory of the three Kazakh sages, Tole, Kazbek, and Ayteke. At the airport, the eminent guests were met by President Nursultan Nazarbayev and other officials. From the airport, the motorcade headed for the locality called Ordabasy near Shymkent, where a massive festival was held. [passage omitted: historical significance of festival].

About 100,000 inhabitants of South Kazakhstan participated in the festival, as well as delegations from all oblasts of the republic, the cities of Almaty and Leninsk, guests from Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and other countries of the CIS. [passage omitted]

Nursultan Nazarbayev gave a welcoming speech. He recalled the event that took place here more than two and a half centuries ago. [passage omitted] The president underlined that currently, just as in those old glorious times long gone, the main aim still remains the same: mutual understanding and consensus among all the ethnic groups inhabiting the republic—that is the basis for the state ideology presented at the recent conference in Almaty. Presidents Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan and Askar Akayev of Kyrgyzstan also addressed the participants of the festival. [passage omitted]

The head of state read out his resolution on setting up a protected historical, cultural national park Ordabasy. Presidents of Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan signed a joint declaration in which they called upon their nations to strengthen friendship and mutual assistance to ensure through joint effort the stability of the social and political situation in Central Asia. [passage omitted]

Having seen the eminent guests off, on the night of 28 May, President Nursultan Nazarbayev and the officials accompanying him left for Karaganda.

Shokhin Will Attend CCC Session in Minsk 1 Jun

LD3105123293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1134 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 31 ITAR-TASS—Russian Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers Aleksandr Shokhin will fly to Minsk on Tuesday, June 1, to take part in the meeting of the Coordinating and Consultative Committee (CCC) of the Commonwealth of Independent States, Shokhin's press officer told ITAR-TASS today.

CCC was established by decision of the heads of state on May 14 and Boris Yeltsin later appointed Aleksandr Shokhin by decree to represent Russia in CCC.

The agenda of the Minsk meeting includes preparation of a draft agreement on the establishment of an economic union and of related documents. In addition CCC will examine organisational matters concerning the CCC chairman and his deputies, and the executive secretariat which will replace the CIS working group headed by Ivan Korotchenya.

After the CCC meeting, Aleksandr Shokhin will leave for Ashgabat on Tuesday evening for a bilateral meeting between the governments of Russia and Turkmenistan. While in Minsk, Shokhin and representatives of the Turkmenistan Government will specify the range of questions which will then be discussed with the government of Turkmenistan in Ashgabat.

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 29 May

LD2905062493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0512 GMT 29 May 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Today's newspapers continue discussing drafts of a new constitution, forecasting which of the suggested drafts stands the best chance of being adopted. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that "it is apparent that it is the president's team which is in the lead and which determines the pace of law making—the results of the 25 April referendum have given a free hand to Boris Yeltsin and his team. It looks like their draft of the constitution has been prepared long before the votes were counted. Yeltsin has urged the parliament to make its draft public. The parliament, in its turn, has "waken up" parties. At present, we have at least a dozen draft constitutions, with each author claiming that his draft is best of all. One has to admit though, that "there is no accord so far in a team working out the constitution. But it is not so bad in the long run that so many drafts have been suggested, since this gives us ample choice," the newspaper writes.

ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI quotes Russian People's Deputy Aleksey Jablokov as saying that "debates over the presidential and parliamentary drafts of the constitution are pointless, since the congress, undoubtedly, will adopt neither." According to Jablokov, "the congress will not adopt any constitution, and therefore, it is clear that it is not the congress which should adopt the constitution. The presidential draft should be used as a basis for the constitution, since it is better considered from juridical point of view. At the same time, there are interesting ideas suggested in the parliamentary draft, and this has been generally acknowledged."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes a lengthy interview with Russian parliamentary Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov who analyses the political and economic situation in the country. Khasbulatov believes that "the first decade of June will be calm enough for the people, not considering the socio-economic situation which is extremely tense now. However, "the authorities do not want to live under real democracy, cherishing the idea of undivided rule," Khasbulatov said.

PRAVDA publishes a statement by Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy on the socio-economic and political situation in society. Rutskoy believes that dangerous propagandistic stereotypes are being imposed on society to make us believe that there is no alternative to the radical-reformatory course and that the choice between democracy and totalitarism determines the attitude to it. "This is a deliberately wrong approach, since in practice, this position leads to the split of society and the loss of the existing opportunity to unite federal Russia on positions of national accord and mutual choice of the way of development," Rutskoy said.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an interview with academician Vladimir Utkin, designer general of missile-space complexes, who comments on problems of conversion. According to Utkin, "conversion is, primarily, a large-scale redistribution of resources with the aim of making better use of them in the interests of the country, its economy and the man. Judging by declarations, we have chosen a way to the international market, ensuring respect, competitive ability and equality to our state. According to common sense, such a market should be entered with appropriate goods. Space technologies are the kind of competitive goods which will enable Russia to take a worthy place in the international market, despite all obstacles which are being made and will be made for us in the future. Instead, we rejoice to declare that instead of unique booster rockets, spaceship equipment and etc., we have mastered the production of household appliances, refrigerators, meat-cutters and washing machines," Utkin said.

Press Review for 1 Jun

LD0106060993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0458 GMT 1 Jun 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight a discussion connected with the preparation and adoption of a new Russian constitution. Vice-premier of the Russian Government, Sergey Shakhray, expressed his opinion in an interview with ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI about the new constitution and who should adopt it. "Most politicians are inclined to believe that a referendum should be held on this issue. Even if the Congress of People's Deputies does not approve of the idea, the referendum might be held, collecting a million signatures or votes of one-third of the parliament," Shakhray said.

TRUD carries an article devoted to yesterday's speech made by Russian parliamentary speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov at a meeting with journalists. The newspaper quoted Khasbulatov as saying that he does not believe that a constitutional conference, scheduled for June 5, "can yield any constructive results".

A parliamentary observer of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, a newspaper of the Russian parliament, believes that first of all the parliament should determine its attitude to the constitutional conference. "Today, only the majority of pro-communist organisations and the parliamentary opposition have a clear-cut stance which have aleardy expressed their negative attitude towards it," the newspaper quoted the observer as saying.

TRUD comments on the results of hearings, held by the Russian Constitutional Court, on the indexation of pensioners' savings kept in Russian saving banks in connection with inflation. TRUD quoted the co-chairman of the society for the protection of the interests of customers of saving banks and holders of state securities, M. Konyukhovskiy, who described the court's decision as double-faced. It is important that the court ruled that our rights had been violated and that losses should be reimbursed. However, no concrete officials are being brought to justice for the violation of constitutional rights of investors and holders of securities, and it is not clear how a resolution, passed by the Constitutional Court, will be implemented, since the positions of the Russian parliament and the government were justified to some extent and we can be disposed of by scarcely effective measures, the newspaper said.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA carries an article by executive secretary of the Constitutional Commission Oleg Rumyantsev and an expert of the commission, Vladimir Lifitsky, entitled "Federalism in Two Drafts of The Constitution." The authors gave a thorough analysis of the two drafts of the constitution, the presidential draft and the one proposed by the Constitutional Commission, and suggested that other variants of the constitution should be discussed as well.

ROSSISKIYE VESTI reports that efforts are being made to find a suitable job for former Vice-Premier Georgiy Khizha. The newspaper quoted Vice-Premier Aleksandr Shokhin as saying that "Khizha has not been dismissed from the top team, and we shall prevent our opposition from making use of this incident for their propagandistic aims or winning him over to their side."

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that as a result of problems which emerged around the Black Sea Fleet, the tense situation in Sevastopol has reached its climax, with all hopes being pinned on the forthcoming meeting between the Russian and Ukrainian presidents.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes excerpts from a report, made by chairman of the central executive committee of the Russian Communist Party Gennadiy Zyganov at a plenary meeting of the party held on May 29. Zyganov declared that the opposition has misled both itself and its supporters, staking on an outburst of people's indignation and the collapse of the ruling regime. "Statements alleging that the regime does not enjoy wide support among the people have not been substantiated enough," the newspaper said.

PRAVDA writes that the constituent conference "societies of friends of the Iraqi people" was held in Moscow. The conference was attended by scientists, cultural workers and representatives of the public.

ROSSISKIYE VESTI writes that a new restaurant and an office of the joint venture "Moscow McDonald" opens on Tverskaya Street in down town Moscow on Tuesday. Three years ago the venture acquainted Moscovites with the taste of the "Big Mac" sandwich. The restaurant in the Pushkinskaya Square had been visited by some 50 million people, which set a record for restaurants of the McDonald company opened in 66 countries of the world.

Black Sea Fleet Dispute Continues; Resolution Sought

Navy Issues Statement

LD2805135493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0949 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—"The Russian chief naval command is displaying profound concern about the situation on the Black Sea Fleet and is prepared to do everything possible to prevent the confrontation from coming to a head, to switch the situation back to the lawful process of negotiations at inter-state level," says a statement issued by the Russian Navy Press Centre and received by ITAR-TASS today.

A large number of warships and logistics support vessels of the Black Sea fleet have raised Russian St. Andrew naval flags since May 18. The press centre describes these actions as "a protest of Black Sea navymen against the unceasing blackmail and moral pressure brought to bear by several structures of the Ukrainian Defence Ministry on the Black Sea naval personnel, against the unilateral resubordination of several warships and Black Sea navy units to Ukraine under the pretext that some of their servicemen had taken the Ukrainian oath". "Things have gone so far," the statement says, "that servicemen of the Black Sea navy are being forcibly, at gunpoint, evicted from their homes, as it happened in Ismail on May 18."

The press centre of the Russian Navy holds that the "Ukrainian Defence Ministry and the Ukrainian Naval Command have been conducting, according to plan, a deliberate policy to aggravate the situation, to torpedo the Yalta and Dagomys (1992) agreements on the Black Sea navy".

Fleet Protests Ukraine's Unilateral Approach

LD2805184893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1816 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunaiskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Rear Admiral Boris Bogdanov, deputy commander of the Black Sea Fleet, who is responsible for logistics, expressed hope that a Russo-Ukrainian summit would finally take place and that the presidents of both countries, Boris Yeltsin and Leonid Kravchuk, would resolve the problems of material, technical and financial supplies and help the Navy out of the present crisis.

Bogdanov told a briefing on Friday [28 May] that 80 per cent of the logistics ships and vessels had raised St. Andrew's flags.

"As long as strikes are banned in the Armed Forces, the Marines and servicemen with the Black Sea Fleet decided to protest in this manner against the unilateral actions on the part of the Ukrainian Naval Command and against their own economic distress," he explained.

According to Bogdanov, there have never been interethnic tensions in the logistics units, although people of different nationalities serve there. He cited the following example. Ukrainians made up 72 per cent of the crews of those 42 ships of the 37th Brigade, which are now flying St. Andrew's flags.

"The Marines are not going to settle accounts and the situation inside the fleet is quiet," Bogdanov emphasized.

"The logistical units of the Black Sea Fleet, which serves to protect the interests of Russia and Ukraine, are combat ready and coping with their tasks," he added.

More Ships Hoist St. Andrew's Flags

MK2905104093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 May 93 p 3

[Aleksandr Pilat report: "Tensions Heighten Drastically in Black Sea Fleet as 181 Ships Hoist St. Andrew's Flag"]

[Text] The hoisting of St. Andrew's flags continues in the Black Sea Fleet. They have already been flown by 181 ships, one support craft, and one boat of the auxiliary fleet. A telegram sent by Colonel General Konstantin Morozov, Ukraine's defense minister, to Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, emphasizes that "an uncontrolled process of unlawfully hoisting St. Andrew's flags is under way" in the fleet, which amounts to "a flagrant violation of the Yalta agreement." The minister suggested that all the ships that hoisted St. Andrew's flags be either withdrawn from the territory of Ukraine, or they restore the status quo—that is to say, fall back on the old Navy symbols.

Your NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent was told at the Black Sea Fleet press center that starting from 3 August 1992, the day when the Yalta agreement was signed, only two of its provisions have been implemented: the fleet's new commander in chief was appointed and the symbols of the Black Sea Fleet (the Navy flag of the former USSR) were determined.

The hoisting of St. Andrew's flags has heightened tensions in the Black Sea Fleet, in Sevastopol for one, and in Crimea in the extreme. The action has been supported and approved of by the National Salvation Front's Sevastopol Committee, the Russian Crimea movement, the Russian Party of Crimea, the Republican Party of Crimea, and a number of other organizations. On the other hand, the "Crimea with Ukraine" Public Organizations Committee, which comprises over 10 parties and movements of Sevastopol and Crimea, took a sharply negative stance on this development. Leaders of the Organization of Crimean Tatars' National Movement believe that this turn of events may heighten tensions on the peninsula and lead to unpredictable consequences.

On 28 May, Captain 1st Rank Yevgeniy Lupakov, chairman of the Officers Union of the Ukrainian Navy, sent an open letter to Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk saying, among other things: "Recently, an anti-Ukrainian campaign of pressure on the personnel of the Black Sea Fleet has reached a climax in Sevastopol and in Crimea, designed to involve them in a political process aimed at undermining Ukraine's sovereignty and seizing Crimea from it.

"All this is being done with the tacit consent and camouflaged support by the Black Sea Fleet command and, personally, Black Sea Fleet Commander Vice Adm. Eduard Baltin."

The Officers Union of the Ukrainian Navy requests that the Ukrainian president immediately take the following steps: all the Black Sea Fleet ships and crews that hoisted St. Andrew's flags should be given the status of foreign ships with all the ensuing legal consequences; these ships should be immediately withdrawn from Ukraine's territorial waters; Vice Adm. Eduard Baltin, the Black Sea Fleet commander, should be forced to stop at once the participation of Black Sea Fleet personnel in the anti-Ukrainian campaign, and if he ignores this demand he should be dismissed from his post and put on trial for antistate activity.

The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet's Defense Commission and the Ukrainian general prosecutor have been requested to launch an investigation into the circumstances of the hoisting of St. Andrew's flags and give an assessment of these actions from the legal point of view.

Rear Adm. Nikolay Kostrov, deputy commander of the Ukrainian Navy, said at a press conference held late on 27 May that "some people have initiated and are manipulating a new explosion of political passions regarding the Black Sea Fleet." Describing the hoisting of St. Andrew's flags as a "gross violation of Ukrainian legislation," Rear Adm. Kostrov stressed that members of these ships' crews "have become hostages to the destructive activity by certain forces in the Black Sea Fleet command who benefit from the political instability in the region."

The Ukrainian and Russian sides have been accusing each other of violating the Yalta agreement from the moment it was signed. Captain 1st Rank Nikolay Fomin told your NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA correspondent that the main violation of this agreement occurred last fall when Black Sea Fleet ships participated in the hostilities in the area of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. At that time he himself served in the Black Sea Fleet (since then he has moved to the Ukrainian Navy) and witnessed the shelling of Georgian troops by the Black Sea Fleet ships. According to reports from Kiev, Russian rates for recalculating rubles into karbovanets have been applied to the Black Sea Fleet without consulting Ukraine. As a result, officers from Black Sea Fleet combat ships receive much greater salaries than their Ukraine counterparts. These recalculations, however, do not apply to sailors from the ships of the auxiliary fleet, and this is what prompted them to hoist St. Andrew's flags on their ships.

According to a report issued by the Black Sea Fleet press center, the main reasons for flying St. Andrew's flags are as follows: unlawful seizures by the Ukrainian Navy of Black Sea Fleet ships, in particular, the hijacking of the PZhK-38 firefighting vessel from Ochakov to the island of Mayskiy; attempts to privatize military units; and the appointment by the Ukrainian defense minister of new garrison chiefs in the Ukrainian cities and rayon centers where the Black Sea Fleet is deployed.

Late at night on 27 May, the Sevastopol City Soviet completed a closed-door plenary meeting. It adopted an appeal to the Ukrainian and Russian presidents requesting them immediately to hold talks in Sevastopol on the status of the Black Sea Fleet, "because the process under way at the Black Sea Fleet is taking on an irreversible nature." Ivan Yermakov, the Ukrainian president's representative in Sevastopol, pointed out that Leonid Kravchuk had agreed to such a meeting and was ready to come to Sevastopol at any time, but no answer was yet forthcoming from Boris Yeltsin's team.

Yeltsin Ready for Talks With Kravchuk

LD3105120293 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Anatoliy Krasikov, the Russian president's assistant, has said that Boris Yeltsin is ready to meet Ukrainian President Kravchuk sooner or later to discuss the problems of the Black Sea Fleet. Krasikov pointed out, however, that such a meeting will require prior preparation by both sides.

Kravchuk said yesterday that he would like a meeting with Yeltsin in the near future to reach a peaceful resolution of the problems connected with the fleet.

Kozyrev Sent to Kiev To Resolve Issue

LD3105191893 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Russian Federation President Yeltsin sent a message to Ukrainian President Kravchuk urging joint measures to resolve the Black Sea Fleet issue. Yeltsin is sending Foreign Minister Kozyrev to Kiev for negotiations.

Ukraine states that hoisting St. Andrew's flags on the Fleet's ships is in contravention with existing agreements on joint Russian Federation-Ukrainian command of the Fleet. The military in Moscow states that the flags have been hoisted in retaliation of Ukraine's unilateral actions and attempts to gain full command over a part of the Fleet.

Fleet Commander Baltin, tired of permanent dispute over the ships, once stated with sorrow that there is too little water and too much politics in the Black Sea.

Officers Send Message to Grachev

LD2905132193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1214 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Officers of the operations control, staff and the rear logistics of a Crimean naval base of the Black Sea Fleet have sent an address to Russian Defence Minister, Army General Pavel Grachev, declaring "their loyalty to Russia and readiness to defend Russia's interests on any territory, flying St. Andrew's flag."

The address, signed by 62 officers, says that "the Ukrainian Defence Ministry and naval forces continue unilateral uncovered actions in violation of Yalta agreements." The address said that "another campaign had been launched among servicemen to persuade them to swear allegiance to Ukraine, seize ships and take the Ukrainian citizenship."

Officers cite incidents of the discrimination of the Black Sea servicemen, who remained loyal to their previous oath of allegiance. Monetary allowances paid in the fleet conform neither to the Russian law "on the status of servicemen," nor to the Ukrainian law "on social and legal welfare of servicemen and their families." The level of the fleet's financing makes the housing problem insolvable. The level of wages of the fleet's servicemen and personnel is not only below the minimum level of subsistence but is lower than the average minimum wage established in Ukraine. The Black Sea servicemen do not have any legal support in relations with the prosecutor's office, militia and security services," the address said.

Officers believe that immediate measures should be taken to find a way out of the deadlock, rendering the solution of a problem of the status of servicemen almost hopeless. They say that intergovernment agreements should be adopted to determine the status of Black Sea Fleet servicemen as soon as possible.

Kasatonov Interviewed on Situation

LD3005131193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0620 GMT 30 May 93

[Text] The media are currently reporting virtually every day about the exacerbation of the situation in the Black Sea Fleet, where already over 150 auxiliary vessels have flown the St. Andrew's flag, thus emphasizing that they consider themselves to be seamen of the Russian Navy. Retaliatory measures are being taken on the Ukrainian side. Our correspondent Tatyana Chemodanova asked Admiral of the Fleet Igor Vladimirovich Kasatonov, first deputy commander in chief of the Russian Navy, to explain this situation.

[Begin recording] [Kasatonov] The fact of the matter is that certain destructive forces in the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense have set themselves the task of the unilateral seizure of the fleet. Well, this runs counter to the interests of Russia and this shattering of a unified navy has cast doubts on many of the men's social guarantees, especially in terms of future service and provision for their families. The people have not agreed with this. Well, all this was done rather gently, and a political decision was awaited. Certain people in the Ukrainian Defense Ministry, however, did not go along with this. First they adopted a tactic of creeping Ukrainization; well, raising the Ukrainian flag is hardly very helpful if 19 percent of the men on a ship have Ukrainian nationality. That is, throughout the fleet 19 percent of the officers are Ukrainian, or 30 percent of the personnel. Now, of course, there are more. The Ukrainian Defense Ministry were not happy when this creeping Ukrainization was not carried through.

So, since the end of last year they have changed tactics, changed strategy. The tactic of suffocating the fleet—in a social sense—was adopted, by not providing the required number of apartments, and imposing financial constraints as compared with other fleets. This was depriving the fleet of a ship repair base, and many other issues. In other words, to bring the fleet to its knees. Colonel General Morozov kept on saying: Let the people decide, let the seamen make their choice. These were his holy words following the conference last March. The people did decide. At the present time the whole fleet, from Izmail to Kerch, is prepared to raise the St. Andrew's flag. Well, of course, we are holding back the warships, but the labor kollektivs are raising the flag. The situation in the Black Sea Fleet at the present time is very complex, since the Ukrainian Defense Ministry has adopted decrees on these measures which are due to exclude vessels which have raised the St. Andrew's flag from the composition of the fleet and the system of financing.

I would like to say that we have a very great responsibility before these people. It is the responsibility of the Russian Defense Ministry to take the necessary correct attitude to these people, on the one hand, and, second, of course, the corresponding status should be given to them. Naturally, talks with Ukraine should be continued at a state level so that all this should be conducted within a civilized framework.

[Chemodanova] Igor Vladimirovich, does this pose a threat to the Yalta and Dagomys agreements?

[Kasatonov] No, it does not, because any agreement between Russia and Ukraine provides for bilateral interests. The St. Andrew's flags may be raised but no one is rejecting the talks process. A moratorium on unilateral actions has been arranged, but the Ukrainian Defense Ministry has in every way supported and encouraged the raising of the Ukrainian flag. We are prepared to assist Ukraine in creating its fleet, but this must not be to the detriment of the interests of Russia or the interests of the great Russian people. Our friendship with Ukraine is everlasting, and the Black Sea fleet, under the St. Andrew's flag, is ready to and will defend the interests of the Ukrainian people, too. [end recording]

Baltic Fleet Commander on Speeding Up Redeployment

LD3005130093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 0750 GMT 30 May 93

[From the "Military Review" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The situation of the Baltic Fleet on the eve of its 300th anniversary is a highly complex one. From the time of Peter the Great its crews and shore units have been based in many ports in the Baltic, contiguous with Russia. Now they have to withdraw urgently and redeploy to other places—and, what is more, in the shortest possible time. As General [title as heard] Vladimir Yegorov, commander of the fleet, said at a news conference, the property of the fleet situated in Baltic countries is assessed at an enormous amount: $100 billion. This is not only the fleet and the ships, but whole towns of officer housing, ranges, factories, sports facilities, hospitals, and sanatoria. It would have been logical to sell the non-removable property to the receptor countries and use the money to build officer apartments in Kaliningrad, where the main part of the fleet is redeploying. However, the governments of Latvia and Estonia are demanding swift withdrawal but do not wish to help. This was one of the reasons for the suspension of withdrawal of our troops from these countries, as Defense Minister Pavel Grachev said in Brussels. [passage omitted]

[Begin recording] [Admiral Yegorov, Baltic Fleet commander] We have to speed up the withdrawal of our combined units from the Baltic states, and we are asking the president of the (Selma) building company association to double the speed of the work. The schedule has been laid down. The Lithuanian Republic has given us a deadline of 31 August. Of course, it's a very severe deadline, which is why I am saying that building here has to be sped up. We are doing all we can to meet this deadline unconditionally, all the more so as the minister of defense and other governmental institutions have made the appropriate agreements, and unequivocally stated so to the whole world, and we are obliged to meet these deadlines. As far as Latvia and Estonia are concerned, if there was an example of the sort of cooperation that we are seeing here, we could also meet the best deadlines. We are doing a great deal to withdraw there as well, and if we have already withdrawn our reserves in time, now the culmination of the withdrawal is approaching: families. Of course, we can only withdraw them if we have accommodation built. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Spokesman on Five-Year Anniversary of Treaty With U.S.

LD2805153893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1449 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS dipomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS— The Soviet-American treaty on the destruction of intermediate and shorter-range missiles will be five years old on June 1.

Russian Foreign Ministry Spokesman Sergey Yastrzhembskiy told a briefing here on Friday [28 May] that it is the first and the only operating treaty providing not for restraining the arms race but for the elimination of a whole class of mass destruction weapons by the two sides.

The spokesman noted that missiles to be eliminated in compliance with the treaty (1,846 Soviet and 846 American rockets) were destroyed by June 1, 1991. However, he stressed, the treaty does not end here.

The document was concluded for all times and gives a firm guarantee that systems banned by the treaty will be removed from the nuclear missile arsenals of the sides for good.

The spokesman added that the treaty provides for a 10-year period of inspections, giving a chance to the sides to become convinced that contractual obligations are observed even after the actual destruction of missiles.

The diplomat said that the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States signed a decision after the Soviet Union's collapse to participate in the treaty.

Work is now in progress on some documents, on which (after their signing) the implementation of the treaty under new conditions will be based.

Moscow Views Possible Resumption of U.S. Nuclear Tests

LD3005141193 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 30 May 93

[Station commentary]

[Text] Russia would like to prolong its moratorium on nuclear weapons testing and make it permanent. Such is the official stand of the Russian leadership, and we follow with our commentary.

The Soviet Union conducted its latest explosion of a nuclear weapon on the Arctic island of Novaya Zemlya on 24 October 1990. Later, already Russia established a one-year moratorium. Although its term has expired, Moscow abides by the moratorium and doesn't have any plans to resume testing. Of course, everything will depend on the position of other members of the nuclear club. So far their proving grounds have also maintained silence. China exploded its nuclear device last time in

May 1992. In April of the same year, France suspended a series of nuclear blasts. Britain observed the moratorium de facto since British components of nuclear weapons are tested at the American site in Nevada, and at a Congress decision, the United States is sustaining a nine-month pause in its program of nuclear testing.

The American moratorium ends on 1 July and so attention is now focused on Washington. A lot, if not all, will depend on its decision. Critics of nuclear tests remind President Bill Clinton of his election promise to secure a total ban on nuclear blasts by 1996. Participants in the disarmament conference, now in session in Geneva, also urge the American Administration to extend the moratorium.

A decision by Washington to resume nuclear tests would, no doubt, cause a chain reaction among the nuclear powers, would cast a shadow on the relations between them, characterized by mutual trust, and this would encourage other countries to develop nuclear weapons, would undermine efforts to prevent such weapons from spreading. The administration in Washington has already made a step in the right direction by giving up the Star Wars program for which, as a matter of fact, nuclear tests were needed first of all, and will it make another major move in the spirit of the times to make its nuclear moratorium permanent?

Warships Visit New York; Vice Admiral Interviewed

LD2805125993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0147 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Kirilchenko]

[Excerpts] New York, 28 May—Under the venerable, vaulted ceiling of New York's City Hall, naval bands struck up "God bless America." This is America's second national anthem, familiar to every American citizen. It was followed by a no less familiar Russian tune, "Kalinka." This made an unusual start to the opening ceremony for Navy Week, which began here on Thursday [27 May]. Crews of two vessels from the Russian Federation's Navy, the destroyer Bezuderzhnyy and the tanker Sheksna, are taking part in this traditional event for the first time. [passage omitted]

"We have come here to take part in Navy Week at the invitation of U.S. public organizations," said Vice Admiral V.A. Poroshin in an interview with an ITAR-TASS correspondent. "The Ministry of Defense gave its approval to the idea, and the question of the visit was decided in April. We reached American shores safe and sound. We have formed a very good impression of New York and its people. We have received a very warm welcome. Benefit will clearly be derived from all this. Our presence here is evidence of the breakthrough in relations between the United States and Russia. Suffice it to recall that Russian warships have not been here for 130 years."

Navy seamen on both sides are striving to make maximum use of this opportunity to get to know each other. The program for the visit includes an exchange of visits between the aircraft carrier John F. Kennedy and the destroyer Bezuderzhnyy, trips around the city, and sports events.

Moscow Welcomes Armenian, Azeri Consent to Peace Plan

LD2805123893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1121 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Russia welcomed the consent of Armenia and Azerbaijan to abide by the peace plan worked out jointly by Russia, the United States and Turkey to end the armed conflict between the two former Soviet republics, according to spokesman of the Russian Foreign Ministry.

However, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy regretted that the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh have not yet adopted the plan saying it does not provide enough guarantees for the secutity of the population of the enclave and for the fulfilment of the commitments by the parties.

However, he told a briefing on Friday [28 May] that Armenia and Nagorno- Karabakh confirmed their readiness to completely fulfil the Resolution 822 of the UN Security Council if Azerbaijan follows suit.

Azerbaijan has not yet responded to the proposal although it was the initiator of the convocation of the Security Council and welcomed its decisions, he added.

"Undoubtedly the fulfilment of Resolution 822 which the trilateral proposals are aimed at must become the backbone of the settlement at the current stage", Yastrzhembskiy said.

He added that positive shifts in positions of Baku, Yerevan and also of Stepanakert confirm that "the necessity to end the bloodshed is apprehended more clearly, real political and psycological preconditions for a peaceful settlement are being gradually created and they should not be lost", the spokesman said.

He stressed that "of great importance is the creation of a joint coordinating military commission with the participation of all conflicting parties which would allow to eliminate many concerns and ease mutual mistrust before the ceasefire".

As a UN Security Council member and a participant of the Minsk group of CSCE countries Russia will continue its efforts to end the conflict, Yastrzhembskiy said.

Foreign Ministry Officials Meet Azerbaijani Diplomats

LD2805175593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1507 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Sergey Staroselvskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—An important meeting was held today in Moscow between representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation and diplomats from Azerbaijan to discuss a series of questions of mutual interest.

The primary issue discussed dealt with the treatment of the Lezghins and other ethnic groups who inhabit a region in the caucusus. The point of contention is an area that encompasses the southern part of the autonomous republic of Dagestan and a northern portion of Azerbaijan, an area which lies in close proximity to the Russian Federation.

Information about this meeting was released today by the spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Mr. Sergey Yastrzhembskiy.

According to him, the Russians feel that the issue of the Lezghins and the territorial question must be addressed as soon as possible and with the utmost urgency.

The spokesman further stressed the importance that this issue holds for the Russian Federation, and said that the Russian delegation to talks with Azerbaijan will include representatives of Dagestan.

Bosnia Crisis Used To Raise Diplomatic Profile

PM2805145393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 93 First Edition p 4

[Stanislav Kondrashov report: "Russia Asserts Itself Via Bosnia"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The Russian diplomatic service has taken advantage of the fact that the United States has entrusted the Bosnia problem to the Europeans. Last week during Kozyrev's visit to Washington, Russia's activeness was particularly striking against the backdrop of reduced U.S. activity. According to Peter Jennings, a well-known U.S. TV commentator, the reason for the "weakest of the main players" trying to fill the "vacuum" and occupy the "vacancy" was that "no one else will do it."

It cannot be denied that it is hard to grow accustomed to condescension (nor should we!), but the situation in the two countries is different, after all, and if the United States has decided not to drown out the others, the task facing the West's new partner—Russia—was in this case to join in, have a go, and have its say: In order to assert itself in the world and moreover in its own homeland, where the Russian diplomatic service is having tremendous difficulties in acquiring a personality of its own in the eyes of its own Russian citizens.

Many people, not unfoundedly, doubt the feasibility of the "Program of Joint Action" ratified at the meeting of the five foreign ministers in Washington. Influential U.S. senators are already attacking it as an unacceptable concession to the Bosnian Serbs. However, this is the first time that Moscow has revealed an ability to take the lead, albeit symbolically, when the others doubted the futility of collective efforts. In the process of taking the lead on this one occasion Russia's foreign minister also had some difficulties—when he was not allowed into the White House's Oval Office and his meeting with Clinton occurred ad hoc, as it were, in the office of the president's national security adviser. Well, this episode symbolically played into the hands of the head of the Russian Foreign Ministry since it provided evidence, as it were, that he does not get along well with the Americans (for the sake of the Serbs' interests, what is more) although critics at home are badmouthing Kozyrev for precisely the opposite.

Thus, no end to the Bosnia crisis is yet in sight, but thanks to the momentum of its development two of its external participants have clarified their positions in some areas. The Clinton administration is not insisting on its role as the chief fire fighter in all world crises. Russia, which saw its paramount task as being to blend with the general "civilized" choir, is aspiring to an autonomous part in the world concert. Symbolically.

Ministry 'Incompetence' Blamed for Snub to Portugal

PM2805182193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 93 First Edition p 1

[Pavel Golub report: "Government Officials Deal Blow to Russia's Prestige"]

[Text] Portuguese Prime Minister A. Cavaco Silva will not be arriving in Moscow on an official visit 2 June.

As we were informed at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the dates for the visit had been agreed on long ago and confirmed more than once. Official documents had been prepared for signing, and a program of negotiations in Russia had been put together involving more than 20 major Portuguese entrepreneurs and bankers who had planned to accompany the premier. A. Cavaco Silva had proposed to be the first Western leader to visit Russia after the April referendum and to inform the Russian leadership of the latest developments in the EC's position concerning the preparation of an agreement with our country.

It emerged that the reason why the visit was called off was that, a week before it was to start, the Portuguese received an unexpected proposal from the Russian premier's staff to postpone the visit "because the head of the Russian Government is busy preparing for the Constitutional Conference."

The Portuguese drew their Russian colleagues' attention to the fact that, in spite of his being extremely busy, the Russian premier had found time to to go on a trip to Sochi "for a short rest"... and turned down the new dates fixed by the latter for their Moscow visit.

No doubt many people still remember what a shock changing the dates of our president's visit to Japan caused there. Changing the dates of an official visit such a short time in advance really is an exceptional event in diplomatic practice, for which there must be the most serious of grounds. There is also no doubt that preparing for the Constitutional Conference is a most serious matter, and that the prime minister has the right to a short rest. However, as this case demonstrates, our head of government's staff—unlike the Portuguese diplomats—proved unable to put these three factors together (the official visit, the fact that the premier is busy, and his vacation).

We were informed at the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs that it had not been considered necessary to consult with our diplomats.

In the given situation it is simply impossible to avoid the label "incompetence," as a result of which not only Russia's international prestige but also its foreign-policy and economic interests have been dealt a blow.

Yeltsin Receives French Party Leader Chirac

LD0106114793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1102 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Krivoshey]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin has met with Jacques Chirac, the Paris mayor and chairman of the Party for Unity in Support of the Republic [Rally for the Republic], in the Kremlin on Tuesday.

During the talks Yeltsin informed the French public and state figure about the constitutional process in Russia and touched upon some aspects of Russo-French relations and problems of Russia's relations with the European Community and all European institutes.

Chirac expressed firm support of the course to build democratic society, pursued by the president and the Russian Government.

Kozyrev Holds Talks With Visiting Finnish Counterpart

Welcomes Finnish Foreign Minister

LD2805124993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1152 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Vladimir Suprun and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—"The current Russo-Finnish negotiations are continuing the good tradition of fruitful contacts, reflect the warm, friendly relations existing between the two states," Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev said, welcoming his Finnish counterpart Heikki Haavisto, who is paying a brief visit to Moscow.

Kozyrev stressed the Russian side's readiness to contribute to the all out development of traditional relations and cooperation between the two countries. The ministers plan to discuss the current state of bilateral relations and their prospects, to exchange views on key intenational and regional problems.

Says Russia Ready for New Initiative on Bosnia

LD2805133693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1138 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Vladimir Suprun and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 28 May—The Russian side intends to begin developing a "new stage" of settlement of the Bosnian crisis, which will become an "organic part of President Yeltsin's "firefighting" [quotation marks as received] initiative in the region, said Russian Foreign Miniser Andrey Kozyrev, following the first round of talks with Heikki Haavisto, his Finnish colleague, who is in Moscow on a short visit. The joint action program on a settlement of the crisis in former Yugoslavia signed recently in Washington is not a one-off action program, but one of the stages of efforts undertaken by the world community to settle the conflict, Andrey Kozyrev continued. The new steps by the Russian side will reflect points of the Washington program, developed by the joint efforts of key partners, he pointed out.

In the minister's words, he "believes unconditionally" in the Vance-Owen plan. Those parts of the plan "which are now ready for this" will be successively implemented. He stressed that the sides will be guided by this plan when fighting the fire.

In the opinion of the Russian minister, the point of the Washington plan which talks about a possible introduction of sanctions against Croatia has acquired particular relevance, as intensive fighting continues between Croats and the Muslim community in Bosnia.

For his part, Heikki Haavisto emphasized the complexity of the Yugoslav problem and pointed to the important role which Russia has played and is playing in developing joint action programs to resolve it. The ministers pointed out that a range of bilateral relations was discussed during the talks. Andrey Kozyrev expressed satisfaction with the visit to Moscow by the new Finnish foreign minister, and said that this shows that both countries are forming close bonds of friendship and cooperation.

Discusses European Issues

LD2805175393 Helsinki Suomen Yleisradio Network in Finnish 1430 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Foreign Minister Heikki Haavisto has visited Moscow and talked with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, among other things, about the situation in the former Yugoslavia. Haavisto has previously taken part in Finland's eastern trade projects, for example, as a member of the Finnish-Soviet Economic Commission. Jyrki Saarikoski continues from Moscow:

[Saarikoski] Foreign Minister Heikki Haavisto's Moscow trip is in the nature of a new man's visit to introduce himself. Paavo Vaeyrynen's successor has for a long time been seen as taking care of Finland's EC negotiations, not its relations eastwards. In Moscow, Haavisto reminded them of his experience with the East:

[Begin Haavisto recording] Of course I'm a fairly old hand on Russia. I was the oldest member of the old Finnish-Soviet Economic Commission. I was in that for 20 years, so I know them quite well. Of course we talked about these Europe questions, and there Kozyrev expressed clearly the hope that the European Community won't put them in a worse position than these other Central and Eastern European countries. [end recording]

[Saarikoski] But as foreign minister, Haavisto is faced with new kinds of crises. Discussed in Moscow was the complex of problems of the former Yugoslavia, in whose solution Russia is taking an active part. Haavisto said that Finland would also be prepared to join in, but only on an agreed basis.

[Begin Haavisto recording] In such a case we are surely prepared to join in within the framework of a mandate given by the United Nations—if it is this traditional peacekeeping or related to that, some sort of self-defense—but of course I see that this kind of peace enforcement and that kind of activity is impossible, (?if) it happens. [as heard] [end recording]

[Saarikoski] Haavisto and Kozyrev had also talked about the Baltic countries. Haavisto said he had explained Estonia's joining the Council of Europe on the grounds that as a member of the organization, Estonia is subject to international controls. Estonia's membership has aroused (?alarm) in Moscow because of the alleged problems of the country's Russian minority. On the other hand, the question of the position of Russian residents in Finland did not come up in the talks conducted by Foreign Minister Haavisto. This is Jyrki Saarikoski, Moscow.

Shokhin Arrives in Copenhagen for Talks on EC Cooperation

LD2705144293 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1330 GMT 27 May 93

[Text] Aleksandr Shokhin, deputy chairman of the Russian Government, arrived in Copenhagen today. He will be holding talks with Danish Prime Minister Paul Newrup Rasmussen. At the center of the talks are preparations for an agreement on partnership and cooperation between Russia and the European Community.

Shokhin Meets Leading Danish Officials

LD2805154093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1453 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov]

[Text] Stockholm May 28 TASS—Russian Vice-Premier Aleksandr Shokhin had consultations with Danish Prime Minister Poul Nyrup Rasmussen and Vice-Chairman of the EC Commission for Foreign Affairs Leon Brittan in Copenhagen late Thursday evening.

The sides examined in detail the remaining unsettled problems of the agreement on partnership and cooperation between Russia and the European Community. They examined, specifically, some aspects of the commercial regimes, including the access of Russian goods to EC markets, employment of Russian citizens in EC countries and social guarantees to them, prospects for improving the agreement as market relations strike deeper root in Russia.

The sides have agreed to step up the work on the agreement with a view to achieving understanding on its key provisions before the European Council's summit session in Copenhagen on June 21-22, which is to sum up the result of Denmark's chairmanship over EC governing bodies. Brittan is expected to visit Moscow for this purpose on June 4-7.

The sides also discussed problems linked with the drafting of a package of bilateral Russo-Danish documents, which are to be signed during President Yeltsin's visit to Denmark, scheduled for June 19-21. They also agreed to take additional practical steps to accelerate the completion of work on several joint documents, particularly on the declaration of principles for Russo-Danish relations.

The Danish prime minister described the consultations as "very good and constructive", called upon to accelerate the progress of talks to raise partnership between the European Community and Russia to a new level.

According to Brittan, who said the meeting was "exceptionally useful", the European Community's commission is eager to reach an agreement "as quickly as possible".

Shokhin Reports on Trade Talks in London

LD3105172593 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 31 May 93

[Report by correspondent A. Gurnov on Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin's news conference at the Russian Embassy in Moscow, including recorded remarks by Shokhin; date not given; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Gurnov] The main result of the talks held by a powerful Russian trade delegation with the British Government was the working out of a number of multimillion [currency not given] joint economic projects. This was stated at a news conference at the Russian Embassy by the vice premier.

[Shokhin] We have already effectively prepared three major projects for implementation. There is a project with Gazprom, for the supply of gas turbines by Rolls Royce; an aviation project, for the construction of an international terminal at Domodedovo airport; and a project to develop the telephone network in the city of Moscow.

[Gurnov] During the visit Aleksandr Shokhin held talks at the highest government level and he told journalists that there had also been discussion of how to work out a mechanism for using the 3 billion of credit [currency not stated] to our country in the most effective way. But the delegation's main concern, judging by Shokhin's words, was attracting foreign investment into Russia and removing restrictions on trade with the West.

[Shokhin] Unfortunately our trade with many countries has recently found itself in a semi-frozen state, and now we are trying to bring the volume of trade to the level which existed in better years with the Soviet Union.

Shokhin Comments on Leaked Letter Scandal

PM0106092793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 28 May 93 p 1

[Statement dated 24 May 1993 issued by Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin's press service: "Conflict Over 'Berlin House:' Aleksandr Shokhin's Viewpoint"]

[Text] On 21 May, ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI printed a commentary on PRAVDA's publication the previous day of a confidential letter from A. Shokhin to the president, setting out the vice premier's viewpoint on the situation that has arisen concerning the Russian House of Science and Culture [RHSC] in Berlin and accusing M. Poltoranin, leader of the Federal Information Center, of abuses. Prior to this, we naturally approached Shokhin's press service, which told us that the letter that appeared in PRAVDA had been stolen and described its action as amoral. This assessment was shared by Poltoranin, whose viewpoint on the situation was published by ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI the next day. By carrying Shokhin's reply today the editorial office hopes that the prime minister and president will not remain on the sidelines of the conflict between two key figures in the executive branch.

The following can be said regarding the essence of the MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS item (20 May 1993) and M.N. Poltoranin's piece in ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI (22 May 1993):

Both items were prepared in the same tone and with the same set of facts, and the desire to deflect the conversation away from a professional investigation of the situation can be discerned. In actual fact, not one document cited in Shokhin's letter to President B.N. Yeltsin was refuted. With regards to the RHSC and the plot of land on which it is situated, their legal status is defined by intergovernmental agreements. Specifically, the intergovernmental agreement of 24 November 1983 regulates, in detail, the RHSC's range of activity and its noncommercial utilization. In order to turn the RHSC into a commercial institution it is necessary to hold new talks with the German authorities and conclude fundamentally different agreements.

It is obvious that A. Uberoy's [name as transliterated] Russian partners, who are not well versed in questions of international law and economic legislation, fell victim to the mercenary plans of the German entrepreneur, who has great experience of real estate transactions. The economic knowledge of Uberoy's partners and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS can be judged, in particular, from the way they interpret the article in DER SPIEGEL magazine. This refers to the material published in DER SPIEGEL (No. 3/47 of 13 January 1993). The article points out that the "Escada" firm, which rented space in the RHSC, invested 5 million Deutsche marks [DM] in the store's construction. DER SPIEGEL does not mention any mythical millions of marks profit from rent finding their way into anybody's pockets. According to the customs of international journalism (in cases when the author of an article is caught blatantly distorting material), MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS' Mikhail Gurevich will have to not only apologize but also eat his hat.

MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS' accusations regarding trips to Berlin by the wives of A.I. Lukyanov and USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy I. Luchenok look somewhat strange, because the person responsible for receiving them was the then-RHSC Director, V.V. Chernyshev, now the Federal Information Center representative in Berlin. Since January this year the RHSC director has been Melnikov, who has never worked in the system of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, was recruited to work in RAMS [expansion unkonown] in October 1992, and who therefore could not have "organized Lukyanov's wife's lectures."

We can only guess Uberoy's intentions regarding the RHSC. But what he has already achieved is known. To date, according to the record in Berlin's land register for 8 October 1992. The Russian Federation is no longer the owner and acts as no more than a user of the RHSC. Uberoy's actions have also caused material damage to the Russian side. Because all revenue from the RHSC's use has been blocked off, the state has been forced to spend around DM300,000 from the budget to pay the RHSC's current maintenance costs. Only the decisive action taken by the Russian Government and Russian Embassy in the FRG have helped to stop Russian property being reregistered to German limited liability companies. As is known, Russian President Yeltsin and government Chairman V.S. Chernomyrdin are taking a firm line: The RHSC must be Russian property.

It is totally incorrect to portray the RHSC as an empty institution. Its activity is multidimensional, our central institutions and regions use the RHSC's services. An exhibition of Nizhniy Novgorod enterprises opened at the RHSC 25 May. Work is being carried out to create a center based on the RHSC for retraining the servicemen being withdrawn from the Western Group of Forces, and preparations are being made for a conference of London club experts.

And lastly, the said MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS and ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI items contain hints that the letter to the president was leaked by Shokhin's department. The press service has already refuted this claim, and one would like to re-emphasize that "Shokhin's department" has nothing to do with the PRAVDA item. The letter was sent to the president 6 April, and had Shokhin wanted to undermine Poltoranin's position he could have made the leak earlier than 20 May. Furthermore, copies of the letter were sent to six people in the government. However paradoxical it may seem, the PRAVDA item and the MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS article are objectively advantageous to "Poltoranin's department," in that they transfer the RHSC question from specific consideration and solution to the political plane and thus conceal its incompetent actions. The crux of the problem is that the good intentions to earn foreign currency in the FRG ended in "Poltoranin's department" falling into the trap set by the German real estate traders from Uberoy's enterprise group.

[Signed] Vice Premier A.N. Shokhin's Press Service

[Dated] 24 May 1993

Kozyrev Views Humanitarian Issues With UN Official

LD2805204493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1515 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Smelyakov]

[Text] Moscow, 28 May—"Russia is one step ahead of other states in raising the whole range of humanitarian problems." This statement was made by Jan Eliason, under-secretary general of the UN, at a meeting today with Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev. The under-secretary general noted the importance of humanitarian diplomacy and pointed out that the international community ought to pay greater attention to the issues of nuclear safety and nuclear waste. In addition, Jan Eliason laid particular stress on the need to seek the underlying causes of military conflicts and the importance of cooperation in UN peacekeeping activities and in efforts to humanize the military sector and to provide humanitarian aid.

The Russian minister stated that Russia is currently paying more attention to humanitarian problems and not confining itself to humanitarian aid. The important thing is to limit the ways and means of pursuing military operations in armed conflicts, especially in those of an ethnic nature, Andrey Kozyrev pointed out. The Russian minister asked the UN to help Russia in its efforts to alleviate the suffering of people caught up in conflicts, especially the civilian population. In addition, Andrey Kozyrev stressed that it is important that humanitarian missions should be carried out under the auspices of the UN and other international organizations engaged in humanitarian activities. Human rights and the protection of ethnic minorities were likewise discussed during the talk.

Yeltsin Again Asks Azerbaijan To Pardon Russian Soldiers

LD2805124293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1132 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin sent a second message to his Azerbaijani counterpart Abulfaz Elchibey asking to pardon six Russian soldiers convicted in Azerbaijan, five of who were sentenced to death.

Yeltsin expressed hope that Elchibey will not remain indifferent to the fate of the convicted, will show mercy and use his constitutional right for pardoning, the presidential press service said.

Peoples of Azerbaijan and Russia are linked by longstanding relations of friendship and mutual respect. Such a humane act will get a worthy assessment in Russia and in the whole world, the Russian president said.

The six Russians who deserted from a crack force unit stationed in Armenia were convicted for fighting as mercenaries on the Armenian side against Azerbaijan. Five of them were sentenced to death and one to 15 years in prison.

Kozyrev Discusses Abkhazia Peace Prospects With UN Envoy

LD3105105793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0955 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Aleksandr Krylovich]

[Text] Moscow, 31 May—Russia expects more energetic and determined efforts by all the parties involved in the process aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement of the situation in Georgia and Abkhazia, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev said today at a meeting with Edouard Brunner, the UN secretary general's special envoy to Georgia, who was making a stopover in Moscow on his way to the Transcaucasus.

E. Brunner told journalists after the meeting that the possibility of sending a mission of UN observers to Abkhazia is now being considered as one of the main measures which this international organization could take. Their purpose would be to achieve an extension of the truce reached as a result of negotiations between the presidents of Russia and Georgia. He stressed that a political solution to the problem can be found only if all parties observe the cease-fire. At present, the conditions for this are favorable.

The UN secretary general's envoy praised the stance of Russia, which is seeking ways of settling the conflict peacefully in close cooperation with the UN. He said the details of this cooperation were discussed during his talks today.

Talks Held With Latvia; Agreements Reached

Talks Previewed; Agreements Described

LD3105122793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 31 May 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The next round of talks between Russia and Latvia is being held in Moscow today. I remind you that the last meeting took place in the middle of May in Jurmala, when three agreements were concluded and a large package of documents to be signed in Moscow was prepared.

[Correspondent T. Orlova] In the run-up to elections to the Seimas and the possible change of the Latvian Government connected with these elections, Latvia and Russia are summing up the joint work they have carried out over the year. They are expected to finalize a number of agreements so that they can be presented for signing. They include intergovernment agreements on the withdrawal of Russian troops from the territory of the independent state of Latvia; on the transportation by railway of personnel and military equipment; on customs formalities; and on the sailing of Russian vessels in the Republic's territorial waters. Also included are draft accords on mutual cooperation in environmental protection and the exploitation of oil pipelines passing through Latvian territory.

Special attention has been given to such problems as the migration of citizens from Latvia to Russia and the protection of the rights of migrants.

The Russian side expressed the hope that it would be possible to reach agreements on the simplification of border crossing procedures, reciprocal travel, and the provision of pensions. The Latvian side agreed in principle with the agenda, noting at the same time that Latvia has a number of accumulated questions to which it hopes to receive answers. It is expected that the agreements will be signed on 2 June at the level of foreign ministers.

First Round of Talks Ends; No Details

LD3105183193 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1600 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] A round of talks between Latvia and Russia started in Moscow today. At the end of the first day, both the Russian foreign minister and the Latvian Embassy in Moscow refused to give any details about how today's meeting went, ITAR-TASS reports.

It is thought that during this round, in particular, final approval will have to be given to the drafts that have already been signed on customs procedures, the withdrawal of troops, transit journeys by citizens on the Kalingrad-St. Petersburg train, on simplifying the crossing of the border by inhabitants of neighboring territory and other documents.

It is expected that at the end of this round of talks a package of agreements between Russia and Latvia will be signed.

Pact on Military Personnel Transport Signed

LD0106095593 Riga Radio Riga Network in Russian 2000 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] A regular round of the interstate talks between Latvia and Russia began in Moscow today. Janis Dinevics, minister of state of the Republic of Latvia, and Gennadiy Fadeyev, minister of transport of the Russian Federation [as heard], signed a government agreement on railway transport on the territory of the Republic of Latvia of military personnel and cargoes of the armed forces and border guards of the Russian Federation, temporarily stationed on Latvian territory, as well as on mutual payments for such transport. Signing the agreement, the minister of transport of the Russian Federation noted that Latvia was one of those neighboring countries whose cooperation in the sector of railway transport is more effective than others.

It is envisaged to sign several other agreements on Wednesday, 2 June.

No Agreement in Financial Settlements Talks With Moldova

MK2805111093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 28 May 93 p 10

[Konstantin Smirnov report under "Russian-Moldovan Negotiations" column: "No Results Yet in the Credit-Settlement Sphere"]

[Text] Contrary to expectations, the Russian-Moldovan talks that took place yesterday in Moscow did not lead to the signing of documents shifting the credit and settlement relations to a special basis that was approved in principle at the May CIS heads of state meeting. Following the results of the talks, Russian Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin and Moldovan Prime Minister Andrey Sangeli signed three agreements that do not address the main problems of bilateral economic relations. KOMMERSANT-DAILY analysts believe that now the talks will continue at the level of experts, who will apparently orient themselves toward the precedents created at the Russian-Ukrainian negotiations on similar questions.

The talks between Aleksandr Shokhin and Andrey Sangeli were very brief: Yesterday the Russian vice premier left for Copenhagen at 1000, while his Moldovan colleague hastily went off to Sochi for a meeting with Viktor Chernomyrdin. Nonetheless, the leaders of the Russian and the Moldovan government delegations managed to initial three agreements whose drafts did not arouse particular disagreements during their preparation at expert level. The documents that were signed define the principles of bilateral collaboration in the sphere of transportation, in the field of standardization and certification, and in the area of social protection for the citizens of Russia and Moldova who work outside their states.

In spite of the fact that, according to Russian State Property Management Committee experts, the transfer of credit relations to a new basis was virtually ready, the Moscow meeting ended without any such documents being signed. It transpired that Moldova is hoping to get a credit worth 14 billion rubles, while Russia is ready to extend an even larger credit—22.3 billion. In reality, however, the positions of the sides did not prove to be so close after all.

The differences relate not only to economic but also political questions. Russia insists that the sum of the credit be recalculated in dollars, that Moldova make an insurance deposit equivalent to the share of payments due for three months, and that the credit be repaid at the LIBOR [London Interbank Overnight Rate] rate plus 2 percent. In addition, part of the credit must go to the Dniester Region. Moldova is ready for the dollar recalculation but is against the payment of an insurance hard-currency deposit. Chisinau is counting on an interest-free credit and does not intend to share it with the Dniester Region.

KOMMERSANT-DAILY experts believe that the new Russian-Moldovan accords should be influenced by the results of similar negotiations currently under way between Russia and Ukraine.

Foreign Ministry Condemns Attack on Border Guards

LD3005131993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1150 GMT 30 May 93

[Text] Moscow, 30 May (ITAR-TASS)—The Russian Foreign Ministry issued a statement today, stating the following:

"As a result of an attack by bandit groups from the territory of Afghanistan, there are dead and injured Russian servicemen who have been guarding the Tajikistan-Afghanistan border in accordance with CIS treaties and agreements between Russia and Tajikistan. The Russian Federation Foreign Ministry emphatically urges the leadership of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to take all possible measures to prevent such actions. For their part, the Russian border guards will act with the utmost determination, using all the weapons at their disposal to protect the border and themselves. The Russian side again urges all political forces and groups in the border regions to give up their irresponsible trial of strength and to look hard for political solutions."

Talks With Turkey Continue on Stability in Adjacent Regions

LD2805201093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1850 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 28 ITAR-TASS—Russia and Turkey continue bilateral consultations about their plans for foreign political activity. As part of these consultations, chief of the Turkish Foreign Ministry's political planing department Mr. Arsyn met with the Russian First Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin in Moscow today.

According to the Russian Foreign Ministry's Information and Press Department, the meeting centered around prospects for bilateral interaction in maintaining stability in regions adjacent on both countries.

The importance of the subject is hard to underestimate, taking into account the extremely volatile situation in the ex-Soviet countries in the Caucasus and the array of ethnic and other conflicts ripping the region on which both Russia and Turkey border from the north and the south respectively.

Japan's Saito Arrives in Moscow for Talks on Territories

OW3105145993 Tokyo KYODO in English 1446 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Moscow, May 31 KYODO—Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Kunihiko Saito arrived in Moscow on

Monday [31 May] for high-level talks on how the two countries should deal with their territorial dispute during President Boris Yeltsin's visit to Tokyo in July.

Officials said Saito will meet his Russian counterpart, Georgiy Kunadze, on Tuesday and Wednesday in an attempt to improve Russo-Japanese relations, in poor shape because Yeltsin has twice postponed visits to Tokyo.

They said Saito and Kunadze will also talk about the July 7 to 9 Tokyo economic summit of major economic powers, the dumping of Soviet and Russian nuclear waste into the seas near Japan and other issues.

The territorial dispute over four islands off Hokkaido have bedeviled relations between the two countries for decades. The islands were seized by Soviet troops at the end of World War II.

Japan's Miyazawa on Kuril Issue

LD2805192593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1715 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo May 28 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa gave to understand today Tokyo will not insist on the inclusion of a record of the Japanese-Russian territorial issue in the final document of the annual meeting of "seven" leaders scheduled for July 7-9 in Tokyo in contrast to previous years.

The Japanese stand was clearly expressed in the political declaration of last year's Munich summit, and there is no need to do it again, Miyazawa said here today.

The territorial dispute over the Kuril Islands was recorded in each final document of "seven" meetings since their Houston meeting in 1990. Last year the corresponding item was including for the first time in the political declaration of the Munich summit, although its wording gave preference to neither side and called to settle the issue on the basis of principles of lawfulness and justice.

In Miyazawa's words, Tokyo intends to firmly keep to its stand on the territorial issue in relations with Russia. He said it would be natural to touch on various aspects of bilateral relations in his meeting with Russian President Boris Yeltsin to come to Japan to meet the "seven" leaders. This is estimated as another confirmation of Miyazawa's intention to raise the southern Kuril issue, which the Japanese Government promised to separate from the "seven" summit agenda, in his conversation with Boris Yeltsin.

Radio Cites AFP on Phnom Penh Meeting on Cambodia

BK2905022293 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1200 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] An international conference on the Cambodian problem will be held in Phnom Penh, according to AFP.

At the headquarters of the UN Secretary General's envoy, the meeting was announced to discuss the election result and the policy to be implemented by the United Nations in this country. Attending the conference will be foreign ministers and plenipotentiary representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, Australia, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, and Thailand.

The conference will be held no later than 10 days after the final election result is announced.

Komsomolsk To Exchange Su-27 Fighters for Meat With PRC

LD2805184193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 28 May 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Various enterprises are doing what they can in an effort to resolve social and economic problems. Reports have come in today from Komsomolsk-on-Amur saying that Su-27 fighters, which are produced there, will be supplied to China in exchange, specifically, for 600 wagons of tinned meat.

Scientific, Technical Cooperation Discussed With ROK

LD2905163493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1503 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Zakharchenko]

[Text] Seoul May 29 TASS—The intergovernmental Russian-South Korean Committee for Scientific and Technical Cooperation met in Seoul for its third session on Saturday. The agenda of the meeting includes joint research projects and exchanges in the field of fundamental sciences and nuclear power engineering.

Bilateral scientific and technical cooperation which began between the two countries a couple of years ago is "developing normally despite the pains of growing", according to Russian Science and Education Minister Boris Saltykov, who is leading the Russian delegation to the meeting in Seoul.

Saltykov told TASS that the complicated economic situation in Russia and South Korean fears caused by instability in the Russian Federation are the main obstacles on the way towards better relations. The Korean side is showing considerable interest in Russian space technology, laser physics, fundamental sciences and the creation of new materials. At present the two countries are working on more than 70 joint projects under which around 30 contracts have been signed.

According to Boris Saltykov South Korea is now discussing the possibility of setting up Korean research centres in Russia in which Russian researchers will be able to participate.

One of the acute problems is connected with intellectual property rights. Russia is interested in attracting major investments in the joint projects on Russian territory, the minister stressed.

Moscow Comments on Yarov's Visit to Vietnam

BK3005102593 Moscow Radio Moscow in Vietnamese 1300 GMT 27 May 93

[Leonid Krichevskiy commentary]

[Text] I can say that economic relations betwen Russia and Vietnam are not uncomplicated. The process of scaling down the two countries' economic relations began two years before the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The following are some statistics on this reduction process: The volume of barter trade in 1991 was 3.5 times smaller than in 1989. The volume of barter trade for 1992 was planned at $800 million but in practice, it reached only $300 million. Similar examples on this reduction are numerous.

I am of the opinion that in this visit to Vietnam, the Russian Government delegation should create conditions for restoring Russian-Vietnamese socioeconomic relations on a new basis of mutual benefit and injecting new life into these relations, helping them to persevere through the current stagnant situation.

It is revealed that Vietnam and Russia still share views on implementing their cooperative business relations, namely cooperation in energy. That is, in exploring for and exploiting oil and gas deposits on the Vietnamese continental shelf. These relations also include potential to achieve cooperation in the field of light industry and in having Vietnam supply Russia with grain and foodstuffs, rubber, and other exports. Both sides unanimously agree that there is no need to totally discard all previous experience on cooperation. Instead, they have agreed to retain the experience that has been most useful to them.

In Hanoi, the two sides also discussed a difficult issue—that is, Vietnam's debt to Russia. I believe that the Russian delegation has suggested a fair proposal to use the still-unpaid debts for building and developing Russian-Vietnamese joint ventures. Both sides have reached various agreements on air transport and marine shipping, and on the avoidance of double taxation for income and property. Of course, Vietnamese-Russian economic and trade relations must be carried out under new formats. Therefore, it is very interesting to me that the Russian Goverment delegation has met with Vietnamese businessmen, including those representing both state-run and privately held sectors. It is important that all of these businessmen are interested in consolidating and expanding their relations with Russia.

At a reception given to the Russian guests, Mr. Do Muoi, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, said: The next decade will see the beginning of a stage of economic growth among countries in the Asia-Pacific region. General Secretary Do Muoi said if Russia wishes to participate in this process, Vietnam would be ready to serve as a reliable cooperative partner and as its solid link in the development of cooperation with other countries in the region. It would be sinful [tooij looix] if we fail to seize this opportunity.

Delegation Ends Visit to Vietnam; Cooperation Discussed

LD3105194493 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1800 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Having completed its week-long visit to Vietnam, a Russian Government delegation headed by Yuriy Yarov, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, returned home today. It took part in the work of the second session of the Russian-Vietnamese intergovernmental commission on trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation which took place in Hanoi.

In Hanoi, agreements were concluded on bilateral cooperation in the sphere of maritime shipping and air traffic and on the avoidance of double taxation in mutual trade. Other important documents were signed.

Terms of Agreement with Cuba Detailed

LD3005132393 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 2230 GMT 29 May 93

[From the "Interpartner" program]

[Text] Cuba and Russia recently agreed to restore economic ties, but on a non-ideological basis. After two years of uncertainty about the course of Cuban-Russian relations, Russia's Deputy Prime Minister Shumeyko and his Cuban colleague, Vice President Lionel Soto Prieto, signed, in Havana, a memorandum on resumption of cooperation in two areas of crucial importance for Cuba: the sugar and oil industries. The parties will start work in two months at the oil terminal in Matanzas Province, which will handle supertankers. The oil refinery in Cienfuegos, linked by pipeline with the Mantanzas terminal, will be reopened. Both these facilities were built with Soviet help, but then closed because of the economic crisis which hit Cuba after the disappearance of the USSR and the socialist countries of East Europe. Judging by articles in the Cuban press, the agreement contains no mention of the unfinished nuclear electric power station at Juragua, the construction of which was halted because of Cuba's financial problems. According to Lionel Soto, the Juragua power station was the subject of separate negotiations between Havana and Moscow, which is seeking a third partner for its completion.

Agreement on Air Traffic Signed With Mexico

LD2905101693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0827 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Gorbunov]

[Text] Mexico City May 29 TASS—Russia and Mexico have signed a new intergovernment agreement on air traffic which should considerably promote the development of economic and trade contacts and tourism.

The agreement was the main result achieved during talks between a delegation of the Russian Ministry of Transport and officials from the main department of civil aviation of the Mexican Ministry of Communications and Transport, which were held in Mexico City on May 25-28.

Today, there is only one air route between Russia and Mexico, connecting the capitals of both countries. Planes Il-62 operate on the route, making three flights a week.

Under the new agreement, it will be possible to fly to Mexico from any part of Russia. Planes will land in Mexico City and Monterey, and from these cities take off to fly to any other cities of the world. The number of flights will not be restricted.

Under the agreement, the Russian airlines will be allowed to use any kinds of passenger and cargo planes to make flights to Mexico. The Russian Aeroflot is pinning great hopes on a new plane Il-96, which is very comfortable, can accommodate many passengers and is less expensive than the Il-62 plane which was widely used for international transportations in the past.

Constitution Issues

Further on Yeltsin Meeting With Regional Leaders

Council Statement Issued

LD2805123793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1029 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (ITAR-TASS)—A sitting of the council of heads of administrations of krays, oblasts, and autonomous districts of the Russian Federation, and of the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg took place in the Kremlin today. The president's press service reports that the participants in the sitting, which took place under Boris Yeltsin's chairmanship, adopted a statement. The statement says:

"The realization of the Federation Treaty and the implementation of the constitutional reform are a single and interlinked process. The natural combination of the Federation Treaty with the new constitution of the Russian Federation will ensure the effective realization of the provisions of the Federation Treaty, and are giving an impetus to the development of genuine federalism in all spheres of stated and public life."

"With a view to consistently implementing the provisions of the Federation Treaty, carrying through a balanced regional policy, and successfully realizing the all-Russian constitutional reform, we declare:

"1. The Constitution of the Russian Federation is meant to guarantee the preservation of the integrity and unity of multinational Russian statehood, to ensure the process of transition to a fully fledged Federation and genuinely democratic system in Russia, and a balanced development of its various regions in the conditions of carrying through economic transformations.

"2. The revival of Russia as a state with a socially oriented market economy, a developed federal system, and a democratic political regime based on principles of the power of the people, the division of powers, and the observation of human rights and effective state power, built on the principles of a presidential republic, developed parliamentarianism, and independent judicial authorities, must be the result of the adoption of a constitution.

"3. The peaceful overcoming of the crisis of power, the protection of principles of people's power, federalism, the division of powers, and the safeguarding of human rights are possible only through the undelayed fulfillment of the constitutional reform, the first stage of which is convening the constitutional conference.

"4. The preparation of a single draft of a new constitution of the Russan Federation and also the drawing up of the mechanism for its adoption must become the main task of the constitutional conference.

"5. It is necessary for the Council of Ministers and the Government of the Russian Federation, with the participation of the heads of the republics of the Russian Federation and heads of administration of the krays, oblasts, autonomous oblast, autonomous districts, and the cities of Moscow and Saint Petersburg, when the constitutional conference ends, to draw up without delay a package of necessary normative acts which develop the provisions of the Federation Treaty in the political, economic, and socio-cultural sphere, and to ensure their effective practical implementation.

"6. The equality of rights for all subjects of the Federation in the socio-economic sphere and in the sphere of safeguarding human rights are to be provided for."

Congress Will Not Adopt Constitution

LD2805131093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 28 May 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] A session of the Council of Heads of Administrations of Krays and Oblasts of Russia has taken place in the Kremlin under the chairmanship of President Yeltsin. According to reports from the information agencies, the heads of administrations have adopted the final document in which support is expressed for the president's draft of the constitution.

[Correspondent Sergey Suntsov] The slowing down of constitutional reform is inadmissible. If a new constitution is not adopted, either dictatorship or the collapse of the state awaits Russia, President Boris Yeltsin stated today in the Kremlin, speaking before the heads of administrations. At the current constitutional conference a unified text of the draft constitution will be discussed. The president's draft will form the basis of it. The constitutional conference, Boris Yeltsin noted, should not turn into something like the congress. It should not drown in fruitless political discussions. The president of Russia dwelled on a number of fundamental provisions in the constitution, in particular on the correlation of the rights of the republics, krays, and oblast. It is proposed that their rights should be equalized, expanding their powers to resolve socio-economic problems. However, for the moment, this does not affect the political sphere, as least in the transitional period. Regarding such an acute issue as that of the mechanism for adopting the new constitution, Boris Yeltsin said:

[Begin Yeltsin recording] The first option is an inaugural assembly. The second option is a referendum. The third option is that a new parliament after it is elected, after elections, should adopt the constitution. I am perrsonally convinced that, no matter how much they try to persuade me—and many people are already trying to persuade me—the congress will not adopt the constitution, even if it were surrounded from all sides. It will not adopt it because in the draft of the new constitution there is no congress. [end recording]

More on Yeltsin Speech

PM2805163593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 May 93 First Edition p 2

[ITAR-TASS report: "Standing Orders Will Be Strictly Defined. Boris Yeltsin Addresses Session of Council of Heads of Administration"]

[Text] "Work on the draft of the new Constitution will enter its final phase in June," Boris Yeltsin stated yesterday in the Kremlin in a speech at a session of the Council of Heads of Administrations of Krays, Oblasts, and Autonomous Formations Within Russia.

"The adoption of a new Constitution will help us to overcome anarchy and to preserve the Russian Federation's unity and integrity. The new Constitution will be the main guarantee of the development of genuine federalism," the president emphasized.

In his opinion, "the recent Congresses of People's Deputies demonstrated with what flippancy and irresponsibility the constitutional system's foundations and the principles of democracy, federalism, and observance of civil rights are ignored. In these circumstances to pretend that everything is all right and to repeat incantations about the constitutional sphere is nothing other than legal shamanism."

"I am convinced that to delay over the adoption of the new Constitution is fraught with dangerous consequences: If we do not adopt the new Constitution, we will condemn Russia either to dictatorship or to disintegration," the president stated.

On the subject of the Constitutional Conference, which opens 5 June, Boris Yeltsin reported that it will last "several days." "A presidential directive will strictly define the Constitutional Conference's standing orders"; it "must not turn into something like the Congress or a political debate." He said that a speech by the Russian president and the election of the Constitutional Conference's chairman are planned for the first plenary session. Boris Yeltsin put forward Sergey Alekseyev as candidate for this post. Then work will begin in six sections, which will elaborate the draft Constitution's final text. According to the president, more than 800 observations and proposals for the draft have now been received. "In the course of the Constitutional Conference's work, we will have to produce a single text of the draft. Work on the new Constitution is a natural part of the president's activities. The faith shown me in the referendum also signals approval for this work. Therefore the presidential draft will serve as the basis for examination by the Constitutional Conference," he stated.

Dwelling on certain fundamental provisions of the draft Constitution, Boris Yeltsin said that "Russia needs real strong authority. Without it you cannot conduct reforms, you cannot organize a normal life, and you cannot revive the country. You will not have a thriving Russia without strong authority." He clarified this by saying that "strong authority has nothing in common with arbitrariness or dictatorship."

The president also stressed that he will insist that the new Constitution "consistently implements the democratic formula of Russian federalism." "The provisions of the Federation Treaty must be integrated with the constitutional norms. That would be a powerful constitutional guarantee of the preservation of Russia's integrity." Boris Yeltsin did not support the proposal by a number of krays and oblasts on granting them the constitutional right to issue their own legislative acts: "It is premature."

Talking about the correlation between the rights of the republics and those of other components of the Federation, Boris Yeltsin said that he regards as justified the enhancement of the status of the regions in the tax, financial, and other economic spheres. But, he added, in the transitional period it is too early to be aiming for equality for all components of the Federation in terms of political rights.

Concerning the procedure for the adoption of the new Constitution, Boris Yeltsin said that "there will have to be a joint search for a solution of this question at the Constitutional Conference." The president said that the Constitutional Conference's main aim is to complete a unified draft Constitution and decide on the procedure for adopting it. According to Boris Yeltsin, there are several possible options: adoption of it by a Constituent Assembly, by referendum, or by a new parliament, once it has been elected. "Personally I believe, no matter how much people try to persuade me otherwise, that the Congress will not adopt the Constitution," the Russian president added, noting that there is no room in it for the Congress.

The session participants adopted a statement stressing that the "implementation of the Federation Treaty and the constitutional reform constitute a unified, interconnected process." The chiefs of administrations state that the "Russian Federation Constitution is intended to guarantee the preservation of the integrity and unity of multinational Russian statehood."

Yeltsin Meets With Constitutional Court Members

LD2905113693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 29 May 93

[Report by K. Belov from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Belov] In the Kremlin this morning, the Russian president met members of the Constitutional Court. Greeting Nikolay Vitruk, the court's deputy chairman, and his colleagues, Boris Yeltsin said:

[Begin Yeltsin recording] Bearing in mind that you asked for the meeting, I do not want to say any introductory words. I want to listen to you. [end recording]

[Belov] Nikolay Vitruk explained that, in view of the complexity of the general situation within the country and the numerous problem of constitutional reform, there is now a pressing need to discuss the presidential draft of the basic law thoroughly.

This was the president's second meeting with members of the Constitutional Court since the body embarked on its work. Today, fewer than half of its members gathered in the same walnut-panelled room. The meeting took place behind closed doors.

Judges Invited to Conference

LD2905112693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1025 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 29 May—Russian President Boris Yeltsin met judges of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation in the Kremlin today.

An exhange of opinions on the progress of constitutional reform in Russia and on ways of surmounting the constitutional crisis took place. During the conversation possible legitimate ways and mechanisms for adopting the new Russian constitution and the potential for improving the new fundamental law were analyzed.

The president expressed readiness to continue a constructive dialogue with the Constitutional Court. He invited all the judges of the Constitutional Court to take an active part in the work of the constitutional conference, Presidential Press Secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov said.

Meeting Called 'Constructive'

LD3105172293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1320 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—"The meeting between the Russian president and members of the Constitutional Court was of constructive character and was held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding," Nikolay Vitruk, deputy chairman of the Russian Constitutional Court, said on Monday [31 May].

"During the meeting there was an interested exchange of opinions between the judges and the president. The judges pointed out the importance of the president's initiative to develop a constitutional process in the Russian Federation and made a number of proposals to improve the presidential draft of the constitution, in particular, concerning the strengthening of guarantees of human rights and freedoms, specifying the membership and powers of the highest court institution as a consultative organ to ensure intercontacts within judicial power.

They came out against a unilateral interpreting of a mechanism of adopting a new constitution and expressed their opinion on a number of organizational issues of preparing and holding the Constitutional Conference.

Completing the meeting, the Russian President Boris Yeltsin invited all judges of the Constitutional Court to take an active part in the work of the Constitutional Conference and in the consistent implementation of the constitutional reform in Russia.

Kostikov Warns of Khasbulatov's 'Dangerous Tactic'

LD3105132293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1145 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (ITAR-TASS)—"The purpose of the organizers of the conference of representatives of soviet power which is being convened in Moscow is to involve all levels of the soviets in the attack on the president, set them up in opposition to the constitutional conference, and disrupt the calm progress of the constitutional process," says Vyacheslav Kostikov, press secretary to the Russian president.

The way in which it has been prepared and the "particular aggressiveness of the latest comments by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet leave no doubt as to the intentions of the organizers of this 'Congress of Soviets,'" he says in a statement issued here.

"This is a dangerous tactic which can only lead to the self-discrediting and self-isolation of the soviets," Kostikov warns.

"The country is in the process of effecting a peaceful transition from the soviet form of power to a genuinely democratic, republican form. That process touches the political and personal destiny of tens of thousands of deputies. More and more deputies are coming to realize the hopelessness of soviet dogmatism and are joining the president and government in building the new Russia," says the statement. "Russia's body of deputies has great political potential. The constructiveness of its position has consisted of channeling that potential into interaction with the president aimed at getting the new constitution passed as soon as possible. It is the constitutional conference that can provide a realistic field for such interaction."

"By displaying political farsightedness and correctly sensing the mood of the voters, the Russian deputies will undoubtedly be able to find a worthy place in the political life of the new Russia," Kostikov says. He notes that "the deputies cannot fail to see that the personal interests of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the interests of Russia have diverged once and for all. The speaker's latest pronouncements finally expose the political and moral nature of a man who entered politics in the democratic group but is concluding his career under the banner of the communist illusions which the people have rejected."

"One would like to hope that the representatives of the soviets, with their great experience of participating in the construction of the state, will have enough political acumen to dissociate themselves from the disastrous course of confrontation with the president and not allow themselves to be manipulated by a narrow group of people representing Russia's past, not its future," the statement says.

Trying To Prevent Constitution Adoption

LD3105164193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1422 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—A Russian lawmaker blasted parliament chairman on Monday [31 May] for attempts to prevent the adoption of a new constitution and preserve the acting basic law which suits the conservative Congress of People's Deputies.

Boris Zolotukhin, deputy chairman of the parliamentary Committee on Legislation, told TASS that Khasbulatov's proposal to submit a third variant of a new constitution to a referendum was made in order to deny a majority of votes to any of the three drafts.

Khasbulatov had proposed to add a pro-communist draft to the presidential and parliamentary ones to suit three major political trends in society.

"I want to stress that if three drafts of the constitution are submitted for the referendum it can be definitely predicted that none of them will get more than a half of votes of the electorate" which are necessary to adopt a new constitution. "I have no doubts that the law on referendum, including that part which determines the vote-counting rules on constitutional issues is well known to Ruslan Khasbulatov," Zolotukhin said, adding that the speaker thus aims to preserve acting constitution "which suits the conservative majority of the congress and parliament".

Meeting on Constitution Begins in St. Petersburg

LD2905095793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0640 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Svetlana Ivanova]

[Text] St. Petersburg, 29 May—A consultative meeting of representatives of the bodies of power of the subjects of the Russian Federation has begun today in St. Petersburg. The agenda of the meeting includes speeches by Nikolay Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Constitutional Commission, and Sergey Shakhray, deputy chairman of the government, about the two drafts of a new basic law for Russia.

It is expected that Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities, and representatives of the bodies of power of the subjects of the Russian Federation will give their views on the mechanism for the implementation of the Federation Treaty and on the role of the subjects of the federation in the adoption of a new constitution.

Ryabov Addresses Conference

LD2905122493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1128 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Svetlana Ivanova]

[Text] St. Petersburg May 29 TASS—"The adoption of a new constitution is the main task of the present day, which should resolve the problems of relationship between the branches of power," Nikolay Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Constitutional Commission, said at a consultative conference of representatives of bodies of power of the subjects of the Russian Federation, which began in St. Petersburg on Saturday [29 May].

Ryabov noted parallel activities in the preparation of the two drafts of the constitution and suggested that a single body be set up on the basis of the existing constitutional conference under the Russian president, which would incorporate members of the Constitutional Commission of the Russian Parliament and representatives of the subjects of the federation. In Ryabov's opinion, these representatives should have a special legal status, separating them from political parties and movements, proceeding from the federal system of the Russian state.

A constitutional conference should have a clear-cut legal status, aims and tasks, "to prevent it from turning into another assembly of the intelligentsia," Ryabov said.

In his opinion, the constitutional conference should work out a single draft of the constitution, taking the best from the two existing drafts. He pointed out that if such a form of the constitutional conference is rejected, this will mean rejecting the settlement of relations between the two branches of power.

Ryabov noted that provisions, questioning Russia's unity and integrity, should not be endorsed by the constitution.

Participants Urge 'Resolute Measures'

LD2905220693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1343 GMT 29 May 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondents Svetlana Ivanova and Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Excerpts] St. Petersburg, 29 May—Observing that the social, economic, and political crisis in the Russian Federation is continuing to develop, representatives of the subjects of the federation, meeting at a consultative conference here, have called on the president and Supreme Soviet to take resolute measures to overcome it.

The crucial task, in the opinion of the participants in this meeting, is to achieve political and legal stability, and for this reason, a new Russian constitution must be adopted this year. The final work on it must take account of the strong features of both drafts, the president's and the Constitutional Commission's, and the drawing up of a package of documents ensuring the implementation of the Federation Treaty must be completed without delay at the same time. [passage omitted]

The meeting was addressed by Sergey Shakhray, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers and member of the working group set up to put the final touches to the draft constitution. He pointed out that two forms of state—the republic of soviets and the presidential republic—exist side by side in the text of the current constitution. Those two incompatible groups of norms, the speaker believes, give the supporters of either view of the way that the Russian state should develop constitutional norms with which to justify their opinions. The aim of the presidential draft constitution is to guarantee the integrity and unity of the Russian state and to overcome the present diarchy. The presidential draft contains three mechanisms to guarantee the unity of the Russian state, the speaker said. They are the market economy, federalism, and a broad measure of local self-government. There are no other ways of preserving the Russian state, with its great regional diversity and its complex multi-ethnic make-up.

Delegates Support Proposal for Conference

LD2905161793 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 29 May 93

[Text] Representatives of Russian autonomies and regions meeting in St. Petersburg have agreed that the adoption of the country's new constitution was an overriding priority of this year. In a draft statement, delegates from the consultative conference have supported the idea of a constitutional conference, designed to make use of whatever best there was in the presidential and parliamentary drafts to work out a new constitution.

Sobchak Addresses Conference

LD2905225893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1740 GMT 29 May 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondents Svetlana Ivanova and Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] St. Petersburg, 29 May—The mayor of St. Petersburg, Anatoliy Sobchak, has given his view of the developing situation in connection with the adoption of the new Constitution. Speaking at the consultative conference of the subjects of the Russian Federation, he said that meeting provided an opportunity to discuss the problems associated with the constitutional process of implementation of the Federation Treaty and the role of the subjects of the Federation in Russia's future. The adoption of the new Constitution was not a theoretical or purely legal issue, said Sobchak. It was a vital necessity and a question of the future life of our state and society.

Sobchak said the presidential draft incorporated all the best elements that could be taken from the constitutional draft prepared by the commission and approved by the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies, though it had to be said that there were still a number of provisions that could be transferred from the constitutional draft to the presidential one, but legally and practically, this draft had already been, to a certain extent, approved by the people, because the main constitutional provisions which the president promulgated in the form of his program before the referendum had received approval in the referendum. It was the presidential draft that should be taken as a basis. In the course of further work on it, whatever could create a really stable and balanced statehood, conducive to further development, should be taken from the other drafts.

The mayor stressed that much had been said to the effect that the Constitution must not be molded to suit personalities or the contingencies of the situation obtaining at the moment, rather, it must be fashioned with a view to the long term. The present struggle was not just between two drafts. Essentially, the struggle was being waged in the national-communist section of the Congress, which had already firmly declared that it will not allow the replacement of the state system, the replacement of Soviet power.

Sobchak urged all subjects of the Federation to put the debate on a businesslike footing by discussing what is and is not acceptable in the presidential draft and what needed to be added in order to strengthen the federative foundation of Russia. After elaborating and approving the draft, the constitutional conference could submit it to the Congress, but only in order to get an answer, yes or no, without endless amendments and discussions. If the answer was no, the only way to adopt the Constitution would be by referendum.

Most of those present favored a demarcation of the powers of the Supreme Soviet and of the executive, and thought that this must be enshrined in the Constitution.

The issues which interested the participants most were those concerning the country's federative system. Those representing the cities and oblasts were clearly in favor of equal rights for the subjects of the Federation and of these being guaranteed by the Constitution. The representatives of the republics tried to evade this issue and expressed fears that if this were done, the rights of their territories could be reduced.

The results of the conference were summed up in a statement signed by most of those attending it.

A stenographic record will be sent to the Constitutional Commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation and to the constitutional conference under the Russian president, so that the views of the participants of the meeting may be taken into account.

Conference Participants Interviewed

LD3005104293

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1930 GMT on 29 May carries a 15-minute program entitled "Reform and Power," in which correspondent Viktor Pravdyuk interviews four of the participants in the 29 May consultative conference in St. Petersburg on the drafts for a new Russian Federation constitution . The four are Nikolay Ryabov, deputy chairman of the Constitutional Commission of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet; Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet; Vladimir Chub, head of the Rostov oblast administration; and Sergey Shakhray, Russian Federation deputy prime minister. They are all interviewed separately, in the Mariinskiy Palace.

Asked to comment on the differences between the president's draft constitution and that of the Supreme Soviet, Ryabov says: "It has to be said that both drafts coincide to a large extent, although there are serious doubts, as it were, about some provisions of the president's draft. These doubts have been raised often enough in mass media and in the press. However, we should not dwell on shortcomings now. We should take the best from both drafts; that is, use positive points in order to form a single text for the constitution. One can go on criticizing ad infinitum, but that will not get us anywhere."

In response to the same question, Abdulatipov states: "I believe that today we should distance ourselves as much as possible from both drafts, and turn to determining the interests and priorities of Russia's statehood in general; that is, we should solve the principal questions that are the focus of attention at present and try and bring them into the draft constitution itself. It is precisely on the basis of these state interests of the Russian Federation, of our national interests, that we should put together an adequate draft constitution. Unless we do turn to the area of interests and peculiarities of the Russian reality, it will in effect be impossible to adopt a constitution. Even if we do adopt one... [changes thought] For example, if the draft proposed by the Constitutional Commission is based on the American model, the draft now proposed by the president is, shall we say, based on the French one. What we need in fact, however, is a Russian constitution, based on what it is now fashionable to call the Eurasian character of our Russian reality. After all, on many occasions various versions of constitutions and laws, various kinds of reforms that had been borrowed from other countries were imposed on Russia. Well, it may have been possible to force them through for a short while, and they may have survived for a while, but at the same time all this caused resentment. So today, by holding referendums, by brainwashing people, I think we can once again adopt or instill one or another version of the constitution, but we should proceed from the assumption that the constitution will not work if the draft is not brought into line with our realities, with Russia's interests, traditions, etc., especially because—I'd like to emphasize this now—our state is, after all, a federal state. In effect there is no other such complex federation anywhere in the world. Hence, if one tries to apply here those constitutions that are conceptually intended for other countries—where they may well work quite successfully—they will not work here precisely because of the complexity of elements that come into play."

On the same topic, Chub says: "Well, the president's draft is more succinct. I do not think a constitution should be a huge volume of laws that people would not be able to read through even if they start, because they would just run out of steam. A constitution, what we call a basic law, should be a succinct document. It should combine a clear outline of the history of the Russian state, and a strong executive, strong authority in general, let's say the executive, the authority of the state as a whole—since reforms cannot be carried out unless there is strong authority. Therefore I find the president's version more agreeable—though certain improvements, certain amendments should be inserted in it. Work on this is going on, in our oblast as in others. There are some proposals concerning local self-government and the structure of relations between oblasts, krays, and republics. Here, in fact, one might discuss two issues—yes, and autonomous oblasts too. For instance, we have this situation where the Republic of Adygeya has now been formed in Krasnodar kray. Is it a kray or not now? So, there are two directions. First, some kind of general parity should be established between krays, oblasts, and autonomous oblasts at this stage. Second, we should address the relations between republics and members of the federation, including the cities of St. Petersburg and Moscow, oblasts, and krays, in order to make these relations equal. We really should not—I don't think it does our image any good—divide on ethnic grounds to this or that extent. This can't be overlooked either. Here I am, in fact, once again in agreement with the president: we will not be able to make this leap."

Asked the same question, Shakhray declares: "Both drafts use the same letters of the Russian alphabet, but there is a conceptual difference between them. The draft proposed by the Constitutional Commission has, through compromise that became conformance, been turned into an amorphous and unworkable document with inefficient state authorities. It does contain many fine ideas, standards, and structures, it's like a handful of diamonds—but it is not a state document. This is particularly important because we need a document to build a new Russian state. Underlying the president's draft is the concept of a strong state, a procedure to ensure Russia's unity, and efficient state authority. It is based upon a combination of principles of a presidential republic, a strong parliamentary system, and an independent judicial authority.

"If one tries to summarize, the president's constitution is a constitution of a state with a socially oriented market economy, with a federal structure, with a democratic political regime based on people's power, on the principle of division of power, and on human rights and freedoms, and with efficient state authority. Our society, our state, where all property used to be state-owned, cannot enter the market economy unless it has strong state institutions. Therefore the president's draft constitution is a blueprint for overcoming anarchy in order to carry out reform. It is a blueprint for preserving and reinforcing a united Russian federation."

The interviewees are then asked about the procedures for adopting a new constitution. Ryabov says: "Regarding the content of the law on the procedure for adopting the constitution, one must primarily rely on the norms of the existing Constitution. This contains three important elements: first, that a referendum needs to be held on the most important issues in the life of the Russian Federation. The second element is the provision that the adoption of the constitution is the prerogative exclusively of the Congress of People's Deputies. I should point out right away that the existing constitution does not specify the number of votes needed to adopt the constitution. This loophole, so to speak, must be removed by this law. The third element follows from the fact that the existing Constitution stipulates that on issues relating to the federal structure the congress is not permitted to adopt unilateral decisions; they must be coordinated with the subjects of the federation. It is these three elements together which should determine the content of the future law on the procedure for adopting the constitution."

Abdulatipov says: "We have to agree on principal ways of adjustment and to adopt, let us say, a constitutional law for the interim period. It is virtually impossible today to adopt a coordinated constitution in a society which is in fact polarized after the referendum. The most important thing which I would suggest, which is directly in my domain—the Federation Treaty—I suggest that we should not force the Federation Treaty into the constitution for the sake of today's compromise. We should work out a constitutional law which would contain a federation treaty and the main mechanisms of its implementation. As for the Constitution, it should mention that the above is equal to the Constitution."

Answering the same question, Chub expresses his conviction that the congress will not adopt the Constitution. He suggests that a constituent assembly be set up to deal with all the issues concerning the adoption of constitutions and amendments.

The correspondent then asks Shakhray whether he believes the basic law will be adopted by this autumn. Shakhray states: "I hope so. In fact, there is no alternative. In keeping with a well established tradition in Russia, we bring every process to boiling point, and then start looking for a solution. In this particular case, a peaceful and civilized solution would be a new constitution as a tool to restore Russia, its statehood, and its authority, and to overcome chaos. A constitution that would lay the foundation for a new electoral process; that is, the formation of a new parliament and other institutions of Russian statehood. Therefore I am convinced that common sense will prevail. The structure of the constitutional conference put forward by the president is in essence that of a roundtable, of a social contract. Maybe the constitution will emerge as a document of national accord. Unless we achieve this, undaunted by our political differences, we are in for very hard times."

Filatov Outlines Constitutional Conference Procedures

LD0106121093 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0830 GMT 1 Jun 93

[Report by correspondent Yuliy Semenov]

[Text] A briefing by Sergey Filatov, head of the president's administration, which started just over an hour ago finished 30 minutes ago. Most of it was to do with the forthcoming constitutional conference, of course, whose format has become clearer. From 1000 on the morning of the 4th, the registration of those taking part in the conference will start, and the conference will open at 1100 on the 5th. More than 700 people are expected to take part. We were told in detail about representations of different categories and I think that all this will be published.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin will open the conference and make the main speech.

The well-known lawyer Sergey Alekseyev is also expected to give a report with a review of the remarks and amendments which have been made to the draft constitution. There are already more than 2,000 of these at present. Moreover, 75 percent are from the members of the Federation. These amendments are mainly about problems relating to rights of the republics, oblasts, and krays which are part of the Federation and the procedure for the adoption of the constitution itself. Interestingly, there have already been around 1,800 applications for accreditation of journalists—you could have a separate constitutional conference made up of journalists.

Apart from two official representatives, there will also be experts from the regions and oblasts having the rights of participants of the constitutional conference, and on top of this there will also be specialists and consultants.

It is thought that the conference will work each day until 1800 so that in the evening they have enough time for meetings, consultations, talks, and agreeing on positions - as always happens at such conferences.

There are five sections - federal bodies, members of the federation, representatives of local self-government, parties, and movements, commodity producers and entrepreneurs. Each section will have its own coordinator.

As for the procedure around the the Kremlin, of course the administration will endeavor to ensure a kind of quiet zone so that, regardless of the positions expressed by various political forces, the conference can operate in an atmosphere conducive to work.

I was interested to learn from Sergey Filatov whether the law on elections will be examined and for which there is a greater degree of agreement in society. He said that this draft law will not formally be examined but that, in principle, the formation of a new parliament, and inevitably, elections, will, of course, be examined.

Journalists were interested to know the opinion of the head of the president's administration about today's conference of soviets of all levels and the position of Parliament Speaker Khasbulatov. Filatov said that he would not rush to give an assessment of this conference but said that Khasbulatov's speech was confrontational and destructive, just like Ruslan Khasbulatov's idea about holding a referendum on the three drafts of the constitution, and thinks this is a desire to bury the very idea of adopting a new constitution in disagreements.

And another interesting point. Journalists wanted to know what was thought of Vice President Rutskoy's work conditions. It is well known that his last meeting with journalists did not materialize. A curious idea was put forward. It is the first time I have heard that, in all countries, vice presidents have their own residence. And there is no objection, in principle, to Vice President Rutskoy having his own residence where he can mix with anyone he wants. This is what I have to say in short about this briefing and I hope to have more details later.

Yeltsin Decree Increases Conference Participants

LD0106083893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0803 GMT 1 Jun 93

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun (ITAR-TASS)—The constitutional conference is to be attended by four representatives from each of the constituent parts of the Russian Federation [subyekty Rossiyskoy Federatsii], including the leaders of both the representative and executive bodies of state power. This is envisaged in a decree released here by Boris Yeltsin. "With the aim of ensuring broader participation by the leaders of constituent parts of the Russian Federation in the work of the constitutional conference," this decree introduces certain amendments to the president's previous decree of 20 May, entitled "On Convening the Constitutional Conference and Completing Preparations of the Draft Constitution of the Russian Federation." The latter envisaged that republics, krays, oblasts, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, and Moscow and St. Petersburg were to send two plenipotentiary representatives each to participate, one each from the representative and executive bodies of power of the constituent part of the Federation.

Officials Urge Congress To Abandon Confrontation

LD2805171993 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 28 May 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The operational information center of the presidential administration announced that a conference of Russian people's deputies, attended by Sergey Filatov and Sergey Shakhray, ended today. It considered matters connected with discussion of the presidential draft constitution and with the preparation and organization of the constitutional conference. A statement adopted at this conference says, in particular, that if the congress decides to persist with confrontation then the participants in the conference will call on all other deputies to follow their example and refuse to take part in the congress' activities.

Commission Prepares Amendments to Draft Constitution

LD3105182793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1756 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The working group and experts of the Constitutional Commission have begun elaborating the draft constitution of the Russian Federation with due consideration for the provisions of another draft constitution presented by President Boris Yeltsin, as well as remarks by the federal departments, and republics, territories, regions and autonomous districts within the Russian Federation, and local self-administration bodies, according to the press service of the Constitutional Commission of the Russian Federation.

With that end in view, a table of amendments to the draft constitution of the Russian Federation has been prepared.

The elaborated draft constitution is to be submitted to the constitutional assembly scheduled for June 5—as an agreed version of the new constitution.

Abdulatipov Urges Consensus on Constitution

PM2805151093 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 93 First Edition p 5

[Article by Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities: "The Constitution Is Not a Bone of Contention, But an Opportunity for Consensus"]

[Text] In principle, rivalry and competition between different drafts of the Fundamental Law is a natural and useful phenomenon, since it enables us to present more fully the spectrum of possible solutions and to choose the one that best meets Russia's circumstances. And if the appearance of another, "neopresidential" draft has led to an exacerbation of the situation, this is due primarily to the political polarization of a significant section of society and to the attempts by radical elements to make the constitutional process an instrument of political struggle.

Such attempts are made by both the presidential and the parliamentary "parties." They allude to the results of the referendum, although it did not in fact produce any legally meaningful results. As for its political results, the most important of these is the population's manifest reluctance to maintain a confrontation between the representative and executive powers. By not refusing confidence to either of them, the citizens came out in favor of cooperation between them. I think it is from this standpoint, from the standpoint of the utilization of the constitutional process in the interests of achieving civic consensus and stability, and not the whipping up of enmity and the deepening of division, that we should assess the situation that has arisen in connection with the existence of two drafts of the Fundamental Law and identify the legitimate path of progress toward a new constitution.

Rising Above Political Expediency

Much has been said and written about the merits and demerits of the draft constitution drawn up by the Constitutional Commission (let me remind you that it was set up back at the First Congress of People's Deputies and is headed by B.N. Yeltsin) and the alternative, "neopresidential" draft. Both documents are still the subject of lively discussion. This upsurge of public activeness would only be welcomed, but it is worrying that the analysis, evaluations, and opinions often bear the imprint of today's news and the current political interests of the opposing forces. What is even more disturbing is that the influence of political expediency is also affecting the actual content of the two alternative constitutional drafts.

It is well known that expediency is a poor counselor on constitutional questions. The country and people need a document destined to determine the shape of society's life not for a year, not for five years, but for decades. In my view, there is no greater danger today than the temptation to turn the constitution itself and the procedure for its adoption into an instrument for bringing down the present Russian Federation body of deputies or, on the contrary, for turning the post of president into a pure symbol deprived of power. The constitution should be made not "to suit Yeltsin" or "to suit Khasbulatov," not "to suit the executive" or "to suit the legislative" branch of power. It should be made for Russia and for all the peoples that inhabit it, it should define the principles and norms governing the life of society and the state, principles that accord with the highest panhuman values and with Russia's historical peculiarities and present-day realities.

I am convinced that we can achieve this stable, long-term constitution only by rising above the current political struggle and working together to create a single draft constitution, guided by the criteria set forth above. This is difficult, but possible, given the good will of all interested parties.

Are the Drafts Compatible?

It has been noted in the press and in statements by officials that 60 percent of the texts of the two drafts coincide. This figure in itself offers no grounds for optimism if the remaining 40 percent of the texts shows substantial conceptual differences. And unfortunately that is precisely how things stand today.

1. It is well known that the Constitutional Commission's draft is based on the premise that the guarantee and the basic condition for ensuring democracy and individual rights and freedoms is a mechanism of interaction between the branches of power that rules out the supremacy of one branch. A Supreme Soviet consisting of two chambers with equal status is vested with the exclusive right to adopt and amend laws, ratify the budget, and monitor its implementation. The president, with the agreement of the Supreme Soviet, appoints the chairman and deputy chairmen of the government and the key ministers, while the president alone appoints the remaining members of the government. The government is under the simultaneous oversight of the president and parliament. The president may not dismiss the government. This way of organizing the form of government ensures equilibrium between the legislative and executive powers and makes both parliament and president strong.

The "neopresidential" draft constitution, as many have noted, is "slanted" in the direction of strong personal power embodied by the president. Indeed, under this draft the president stands above the three branches of power—the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary. He has very wide powers in the sphere of cadre policy and can dismiss the government. He holds in his hands a powerful tool, the nationwide referendum, which he may declare on his own initiative. He adopts edicts and issues directives. Since the draft does not stipulate that these edicts and directives can be restricted to any particular sphere, but it does state that the president is the guarantor of the Constitution, it follows that he can adopt a decision on any issue. If parliament disagrees with anything, it can be dissolved. Parliament is not granted the right to suspend or revoke enactments of the president or government. The head of state may also exercise judicial functions.

Obviously the alternative draft contains too many departures from the principle of separation of powers, in a way that favors the executive. It does not contain enough reliable legal mechanisms offering a guarantee against the supremacy of presidential power over the executive, legislature, and judiciary, and it thus creates a legal basis for turning a presidential republic into a republic run by a president who can do anything, that is to say, an authoritarian system. The survival of democracy in Russia will depend on the convictions of the individual who becomes president. That is, ultimately, on historical accident, rather than on the Fundamental Law.

Clearly, the two versions of the draft constitution differ substantially as regards the organization of state power. Is it possible to "reconcile" them, to fuse them into one? I think it is, because each of them reflects a real need experienced by the Russian state in the course of reform. The need for a strong executive which operates autonomously and effectively and is capable of extricating the country from the crisis, overcoming hyperinflation, attacking crime and corruption, and skillfully implementing market reforms. And the need for genuine democracy, the cornerstone of which is the balance of representative, executive, and judicial powers, so as to rule out the supremacy of one of these over the others and guard against dictatorship by individuals, parties, or groups.

2. Both the Constitutional Commission's draft and the one submitted by the president attach paramount importance to the question of citizens' political and socioeconomic rights and freedoms. It is hard to escape the impression that the "neopresidential" draft follows the spirit of liberal ideology and is oriented toward economic and social values which are characteristic, at best, of the first half of the 20th century. This is clear, first, from the fact that it lacks provisions covering state regulation of economic and social life, which, as is well known, forms an integral part of a modern market economy and is the practice to one degree or another in every developed country. It is clear, second, from the fact that in the "neopresidential" draft the social functions of the state and society are drastically curtailed and social protection for the population is weakened compared with the provision made in the existing Constitution and in the Constitutional Commission's draft.

Implementing the Principle of Federalism

Today one can only offer Russia a draft constitution which consistently implements the principle of federalism: This principle lies outside short-term political expediency. At first glance, this task does not appear difficult: All you have to do is to incorporate the text of the Federation Treaty in the draft. This has been done in both drafts of the constitution, but purely on the basis of short-term political expediency. And it is no accident, judging by the reaction of the heads of organs of representative and executive power in many republics, krays, oblasts, and autonomous formations, that the present drafts do not meet with their support specifically as regards their handling of federal relations.

One reason is obvious, and is set forth in the statement of the leaders of 11 republics' Supreme Soviets on the draft constitution submitted by the Russian Federation president. The crux of the point of view put forward by the statement's authors is that what they need is not the mechanical inclusion of the text of the Federation Treaty in the text of the draft constitution; what they need is a working Treaty. To this end, in their view, it is necessary to incorporate the Federation Treaty in the text of the new constitution in such a way as to take full account of the republics' present legal status as enshrined in their existing constitutions and to provide legislators with clear and concrete legal norms to serve as guidelines for the creation of a mechanism for implementing the Federation Treaty.

To translate this viewpoint into the language of politics, what it means is this: The constitution should not only preserve the full wealth of the content of the Federation Treaty and not only turn it into a document with real force, it should also make provision for the possibility of its future development in terms of the demarcation of powers between federal organs and the republics' organs of power. The only thing that is not clear is whether the statement's authors perceive any logical limits or boundaries to the process of the shareout of power between the center and the republics, or whether they think that this process can in fact go on constantly and continuously, up to and including the republics' total secession from the Russian Federation.

In order to avoid this, it is perhaps desirable to draw up a special constitutional law which would include both the Federation Treaty and the mechanism for its implementation. Attempts to drive a wedge between components of the Federation by exploiting the theory of their equality must not be encouraged.

Another important aspect that is not reflected in the two drafts of the constitution is the position of the Chechen Republic and Tatarstan. Whereas, because of the internal political clashes and effective dyarchy in Chechnya, it is not yet easy to plan the development of its relations with the federal center, matters are very different as regards the Republic of Tatarstan. Whether the president, government, and parliament of the Russian Federation like it or not, the problem of the relationship between the Russian Federation and Tatarstan is a real one, and needs resolving—both politically and constitutionally. Tatarstan cannot be permitted to remain outside the constitutional process. But nor, in my view, is it permissible to play for the convenience of the moment, without considering the future of federal statehood.

A third factor that is a real presence in the country's life but also is not reflected in either draft Constitution is the desire of krays, oblasts, federal-status cities, and autonomous okrugs to see their own status as equal to that of the republics. It is well known that the Vologda Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies added a question on the oblast's status to the questions in the Russia-wide referendum, and, on the basis of the population's opinion, the other day declared the Vologda region to be a state-territorial formation. St. Petersburg did much the same. It cannot be ruled out that other krays, oblasts, and autonomous formations will follow this path. It is also well known that many republics do not approve of such aspirations and insist that the present status of the Federation components be maintained. This problem cannot be ignored any longer, it must be examined by all components of the Federation with a view to finding a compromise solution that suits everyone. Especially since in essence that solution is contained in the Federation Treaty, admittedly not in overt form.

Historical experience shows that decisions on fundamental questions relating to the structure of a federal state and its constitution should only be made on the basis of consensus. Here it is useless and damaging to impose the will of the majority on a dissident minority. Sooner or later the conflict will come to the surface.

A fourth aspect closely associated with the problem of the different status of Federation components relates to the criteria for their representation in one chamber of the federal parliament—the Federal Assembly (in the Constitutional Commission's draft) or the Federation Council (in the "neopresidential" draft). The second of these drafts simply grants 50 percent of seats in that chamber to deputies elected in republics and autonomous formations; the first draft allows for this as an option (this is also dealt with in appendices to the Federation Treaty). According to the "neopresidential" draft, the Federation Council plays the role of upper chamber. To give the republics and autonomous formations the same number of seats in that chamber as all the other krays and oblasts, which account for more than 80 percent of Russia's population, could be perceived, and is perceived by many, as another manifestation of the regions' inequality.

Lastly, mention must be made of Article 66 of the "neopresidential" draft, which includes the heads of the executive power and government (administration) of Federation components "in the single system of executive power of the Russian Federation," and Article 67, whereby the "powers of the federal state power are exercised at local level by federal territorial organs and officials." These two articles in effect reproduce the administrative pattern characteristic of unitary states, which has nothing in common with a federal system.

All the aforesaid leads me to conclude that neither of the drafts yet provides the necessary basis from the viewpoint of the task of transforming Russia from a unitary state into a truly federal state. And this is no accident: Not so long ago both O.G. Rumyantsev and S.M. Shakhray were opponents of the Federation Treaty, and you cannot change your opinions the way you change your gloves. The publication and discussion of the drafts have revealed something lacking, a lack that was not previously so noticeable—namely, a single understanding, a single view, in the federal structures and the power structures of the Federation components, of the actual principle of federalism and its legal embodiment. And this, in turn, renders unlikely and even dangerous the accelerated creation in the near future of a draft constitution acceptable to all the Federation components and at the same time ensuring the preservation of Russia as a single, multinational state with a strong, fully valid center.

The Road to Compromise

It seems to me that in the existing situation both the president and parliament should show political realism, self-criticism, and courage. Self-criticism as regards their assessments of the prepared drafts of the constitution. Realism, in recognizing that given the present level of ideological and political polarization and the obsession of parties, movements, and power institutions with the interests and needs dictated by the present day, one can hardly count on creating a constitution capable of serving for a prolonged historical period. Courage, in the willingness of opposing forces to join in constructive and honest cooperation and work toward a reasonable compromise the fruit of which would be such a Fundamental Law.

Recent statements by officials and political leaders make it possible to hope that constructive cooperation is possible. Especially if no one puts forward any preliminary conditions with the aim of securing unilateral advantages. I am convinced that in the existing conditions a constitutional conference bringing together representatives of the president, parliament, the judiciary, the Federation components, parties, and movements could be the body to prepare a single draft of the new constitution.

The best solution, in my view, would be not to wait for the adoption of a new constitution, but to arrive at an agreement in principle, and then to adopt a kind of "provisional constitution" or a constitutional law for the transitional period.

This is highly necessary in order finally to deliver the country and people from a prolonged and exhausting confrontation between powers which offers no opportunity really to set about resolving pressing economic and social problems.

Naturally, both the "provisional constitution" and the new one can and must be adopted only by constitutional means, if not by the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, then certainly by a referendum. Let us learn the main lesson of these turbulent times: What is truly good and long-lived springs only from consensus, not enmity.

Opposition Prepares for 3 Jun March

MK2805091493 Moscow MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS in Russian 28 May 93 p 1

[Interview with Ilya Konstantinov, a leader of National Salvation Front, by Aleksey Bogomolovl at Moscow City Hall on 27 May: "Konstantinov Promises To Stand up for Petrovka 38"]

[Excerpts] Discussions wound up yesterday in Moscow's City Hall of routes of marches and venues of rallies to be held by the National Salvation Front and the Public Committee for Russian Reforms. [passage omitted]

As the discussion ended, I asked I. Konstantinov a few questions.

[Bogomolov] To what extent are National Salvation Front supporters amenable to control, and what are you going to do if they start smashing windows on Petrovka [street where Moscow's criminal investigation headquarters is located] and commit other illegal acts?

[Konstantinov] Such actions on the part of participants in the march are impossible if the leaders and organizers do not want this. If Deputies Konstantinov, Pavlov, Baburin, and Sayenko stand up and shield Petrovka 38 [Moscow militia headquarters], do you think our supporters would attempt any actions like storming? This would never happen!

[Bogomolov] Where will you be during the march?

[Konstantinov] Remember that sequence from the film "Chapayev?" Initially, I will be at the head of the column. If additional control is required as it moves past Petrovka, I would remain on that spot.

[Bogomolov] The National Salvation Front speaks of a possible civil disobedience campaign.

[Konstantinov] Any discussion of civil disobedience starts when this or that person vested with state power takes anti-constitutional actions. Our supporters' actions, should the executive branch violate constitutionality, would be determined by how dangerous the actions by the executive branch are.

Muscovites Polled on Constitution-Related Issues

MK2905082093 Moscow KURANTY in Russian
29 May 93 p 1

[Oleg Savelev report under the rubric "Social Barometer": "Muscovites on Constitution?]

[Text] On 25 May 1993 the Moscow branch of the All-Russia Center for the Study of Public Opinion ("Komkon-2") conducted a flash poll of 1,431 residents of the capital city. The answers to some of the questions in this survey about discussion and adoption of a Russian constitution are given in percentages.

There is political wrangling about which draft constitution should be adopted; do you think Russia's future really depends on whether the first or the second draft is adopted?
It does—38
This is rivalry between authorities—37
Hard to say—25

A constitutional conference is to convene on 5 June according to President B. Yeltsin's plan. Do you or do you not approve of its calling in principle?
I do—49
I do not—24
Hard to say—27

Which, in your view, would be best: that the constitutional conference discuss and update the draft constitution proposed by the president, or that it discuss various draft constitutions and agree on one?
Discuss the president's draft—17
Agree on one—66
Hard to say—17

What do you think: Should or should not this conference have the right not only to discuss but also to adopt a constitution?
It should—41
It should not—33
Hard to say—26

Communist Party Leaders Oppose Yeltsin's Constitution

LD3105183493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1811 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correpsondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—"Russian society generally is not ripe for the adoption of the 'constitution of victorious capitalism'", stated the memorandum of Russian Communist Party leadership. It was presented today at the press-conference held by the communists expressing their attitude towards constitutional process in Russia.

Communists regard the constitutional conference opening on Saturday [5 June] strictly as a consultative body working out the final draft constitution. According to them, not only the presidential draft but also alternative variants should be discussed.

Considering new elections to be "peaceful way out of the political crisis", the communist leaders call for the creation of a political bloc of patriotic forces under the slogans "for Soviet statehood", "for social justice", "for Russia indivisible and federative".

Communist leader Gennadiy Zyuganov stressed that if the elections take place, a coalition of all communust and socialist parties is possible as well as an alliance with the centrists including the Civic Union.

Political Issues

Rutskoy Deplores 'Campaign' Against Him

PM3105142193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 May 93 p 2

["Statement by Russian Federation Vice President A.V. Rutskoy"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] In the atmosphere of political defamation and the restriction of my constitutional rights, I, as vice president of the Russian Federation, am forced to appeal directly to the citizens and public of Russia.

Official propaganda controlled by Poltoranin's Federal Information Center is trying to create the impression of major achievements in democracy and market reform in Russia. In actual fact the economic, political, and legal situation in the country is deteriorating. The uncontrollability of the state's economic and financial systems is reaching danger point. Nothing but empty promises lie behind the words about amending state policy to make it more socially oriented. The problems of unemployment and social tension in society are becoming deeper. Most of Russia's population, as before, remains untouched by reform. The impossible position of pensioners, students, and workers in culture, science, and education is getting worse. The strategy and tactics of reform, their consistent implementation, and the main priorities have still not been defined. No acceptable financial, investment, or tax conditions have been created for Russian enterprises in the production sphere.

Instead, society is having imposed upon it dangerous propaganda stereotypes about there being no alternative to the radical reform course, and about attitudes toward it being determined by a choice between democracy and totalitarianism. This is a deliberately false approach. In practice this line will lead to a split in society and the loss of the existing opportunities to unite federal Russia on the basis of national consensus and a joint choice of paths of development.

The authorities' growing inability to critically interpret the prevailing situation and their policy and actions represents a dangerous political symptom. Instead of really assessing the situation in the economy and the social sphere and introducing measures to stabilize it, all-Russian experiments are being pursued in the so-called "market leap forward" and the further politicization of society. Against this backdrop the presidential structures of power are making promises to the people that they know they are unable to keep.

The postreferendum syndrome is encouraging the authorities to take more and more steps that deviate from the aims of genuine reform in Russia. Strong-arm administrative methods in the struggle against political dissent are becoming stronger and stronger. A cadre purge is under way, and people are being assessed on their level of loyalty to the precepts of the radical reformers. Such concepts as political tolerance and openness to dialogue and to the quest for compromise are rejected out of hand. This artificial ideological confrontation has been transferred to the constitutional process. The strong-arm propaganda of the presidential draft constitution is overshadowing the fact that the adoption of this fundamental law would mark the end of democracy and federalism. A willingness for compromise and consensus are particularly necessary in this important matter...

The above determines the essence of my stance and my actions both as a politician and as the country's vice president. I am profoundly concerned about the fate of Russia and its people, and about the country's ability to get out of the latest historic dead end where it has been left by the new ideological prophets.

In their attempts to distort and make fun of my political approaches, presidential structures—including, of course, the mass media—are doing everything possible to ensure that the fundamental differences of opinion on the strategic choice for Russia are undermined by squabbling and politicking. Insults, fabrication, deliberate lies, and badgering have been used. But in actual fact I have been and continue to be true to [na urovne] the promises in Russian official politics that were made to the people during the presidential elections two years ago.

Unfortunately, the unconstitutional campaign against the Russian Federation vice president has been sanctioned by the head of state. Although, incidentally, as on many other issues, the foremost role is being played not so much by the president himself as by his entourage headed by S.A. Filatov, head of his administration. Methods of apparatus reprisal well-known from days of yore are being put into practice. In addition to the well-known actions complicating the exercise of the vice president's constitutional duties, new and even more absurd and illegal actions are being taken. By decision of S.A. Filatov, secretariat staffers who are to be laid off and are entitled by law to two months notice to carry out their duties, have been fired and had their official passes confiscated without prior arrangement. As a result, the vice president's apparatus has to all intents and purposes been paralyzed.

Moreover, the leader of the President's Administration and the chief of the Main Security Administration have made so bold as to take it upon themselves to strip the Russian Federation vice president of his ability to receive representatives of sociopolitical movements and parties—Russian and foreign citizens—in his office in the Kremlin. Yet another unconstitutional step in line with the entire current policy of the President's Administration has thereby been taken. Stripping the Russian Federation vice president of the ability to play host to representatives of the Russian and foreign press runs counter to all norms of democratic law and order, cuts across the provisions of the Russian Federation law on the press, and is a direct breach of the Russian Constitution (Article 43).

You get the impression that this surfeit of zeal in the attempts to discredit the vice president has also been caused by the fact that both official and government circles cannot forgive the vice president for his speeches at the Supreme Soviet session 16 April this year on the problems of fighting corruption—particularly in the top echelons of power. I think that the results of the investigations passed to the General Prosecutor's Office will confirm that my assessments and conclusions were well-founded.

The ultimate goal of all these actions is clear to me. It is to remove the Russian Federation vice president from power structures and thereby launch an out-and-out attack on all those who think differently or who are protesting the madness of the crisis and the collapse of Russia. I wish to state with complete authority that my position has been and continues to be one of respect for constitutional law and order, and service of the interests of people and society.

I am convinced that most Russian citizens who are concerned about the consequences of the country's moral, economic, and geopolitical degradation will support me in this position.

While remaining Russian Federation vice president, I reserve the right to take such steps—including steps of a constitutional nature—as may be required in the prevailing situation.

Filatov: Rutskoy 'May Be Ousted' From Kremlin

LD0106120393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1104 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Russian rebel Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy may be ousted from the Kremlin and get an office in the current official residence of Boris Yeltsin, according to head of the presidential staff Sergey Filatov.

He told reporters on Tuesday [1 June] that there is no country in the world where the president and the vice-president occupy one and the same residence.

Rutskoy, who publicly opposed the president, had been already stripped of all his duties, limousine office car and his staff was drastically reduced. He was denied the right to hold press conferences in the Kremlin.

The latest decision to move Rutskoy out of the Kremlin coincided with bitter attacks of the vice-president on Boris Yeltsin who he accused of "economic crime against the people".

Addressing local legislators on Tuesday Rutskoy proposed to them to instruct the parliament to dissolve the government and create another one which is "capable of taking the country out of the current situation".

The vice-president proposed to sue those "who led the country to the crisis", a clear referrence to the president and his team.

Deputy Speaker Nikolay Ryabov tried to play down Rutskoy's emotional statements saying that they should not be viewed from the political point of view.

"Economic crimes are investigated by those who are authorised and they study also the documents submitted by the vice-president", Ryabov told reporters, referring to corruption charges advanced by Rutskoy before the confidence vote to Yeltsin in April.

Ryabov reiterated his earlier call for reconciliation and cooperation with the president and criticised the parliament speaker for convening local legislators on Tuesday.

It is inadmissible that the subjects of the federation "are torn apart, made to hold different meetings, called upon to adopt various constitutions", he said.

The nationwide referendum which voted confidence to the president makes it necessary to arrive to one conclusion - "not to struggle against each other, but to look for points of coincidence", he added.

Ryabov, signalling a growing split among Yeltsin's opponents, said he is against the proposal of Ruslan Khasbulatov to submit three draft constitutions to a referendum saying none of the drafts will get the necessary majority of votes.

Khasbulatov Interviewed on Current Situation

PM3105125193 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 May 93 pp 1-2

[Interview with Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA chief editor Valentin Chikin; date and place of interview not stated: "Power and Wielding Power"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA chief editor Valentin Chikin asked Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, to answer a number of questions of interest to our newspaper's readers.

[Chikin] I shall say immediately, Ruslan Imranovich, that our readers are upset most by the deepening of the crisis. Before the referendum we conducted a kind of rehearsal with readers—we sought to ascertain how they would vote. To our surprise in a short time we received over 52,000 letters. And the replies were quite unanimous, by no means dictated by television. People accompanied their answers with highly expressive additions. We ascertained from this mail that people are very worried that the people are constantly being driven into impasses, from one impasse to another. And the referendum itself was also an impasse. Now there is a new impasse—the constitutional impasse. What in your opinion are the motive forces of this new action, which has again alarmed society? How do you predict the development of events for the next few weeks?

[Khasbulatov] The referendum and the constitutional battles were designed to distract attention from the harsh reality. What motive forces? There are entire avenues here. First there is, of course, the failure of the chosen methods and means of economic reform. The year of 1992 passed for us under a minus sign in economic reforms. I am convinced that if the practical policy of reforms had conformed to legislation then we would not have had that minus sign. The point is that through arbitrary deviations from the law, through various government decrees, an attempt was made to accelerate the processes of market transformation. As a rule this acceleration is resulting in fights in the economic sphere, since the ruling regime's economic defeat is one of the main reasons for today's attempts to shift the center of attention of public opinion into the political sphere. That is to distract people from the way they are living.

With a group of deputies I have just visited Novgorod, Pskov, and leading enterprises there. These meetings showed how worried people are by the abnormal situation in our economy. A recently prosperous enterprise with world connections or a splendid agrarian firm, fine workers—and they are all keeping afloat on enthusiasm alone, quite literally. Specialists and workers are straining to keep their enterprise or farm afloat. And market relations have been put into operation and there are international ties—all that is lacking is a normal economy. It would seem that people are not conservatives, they stand on the most forward-based positions, they are for the market, for democracy, for all that is most progressive, but they have been put in a terrifying situation. Centralization is terrifying, everything is decided by the ministry, Chubays decides everything. We are speaking of "the state's withdrawal from the economy" yet in actual fact the ruling stratum is being strengthened...

And it seems to me that the ruling regime is seeking to avoid these failures in the debate about how some people are allegedly preventing the reforms from being implemented. Of course we would not like the kind of reforms which are being implemented but frankly we are, unfortunately, powerless to curb that too, since we are not the cause of it. That is the first point.

The second reason for imposing on us political debates on the problems of the Constitution is the "Rutskoy factor." The vice president spent many months flushing out corrupt officials through various bodies and tried to bring charges against the culprits and, having achieved nothing, was obliged in parliament to make public only a small proportion of what the commission had revealed. And instead of a serious large-scale analysis and an honest study of how matters stand with regard to corruption at the federal level in the capital, St. Petersburg, and Yekaterinburg and in the regions, instead of that, there began a campaign designed to obscure these flagrant problems and to impose abstract discussions on society.

The third reason is to try, under cover of the din, to nonetheless push through a dictatorial Constitution, in practice dispelling and destroying representative power. Unfortunately, the regions do not always understand that danger. Even the leaders of the soviets sometimes say: You are in conflict there, yet we are living as friends... People do not fully realize that there cannot even be any question of any conflict... If you take the entire mass of state employees then the system of management of executive power accounts for 97 percent. And only 2.1 percent are employed in the representative organs of power, including the Supreme Soviet apparatus. And 0.9 percent are the legal and prosecutor's office personnel. What conflict can there be here? We are at odds with another circumstance: Executive power is trying with all its might to bring down and destroy representative power.

If under these conditions the representatives of elected organs—it does not matter whether it is a rural soviet or the Supreme Soviet—are displaying a lack of resolve in defending their rights and are even trying to struggle against that representative power then this is simply... moral degeneration. You have received a mandate from the people—you must defend their interests and serve your mandate honestly. And if you cannot or do not want to do that, then please go. Into executive power, business, science, culture...

It is representative power that makes the state democratic. Democracy and representative power are virtually synonymous. It is no accident that in world practice even in dictatorial regimes the constitution is adopted by the supreme legislative organ on behalf of the people. The other organ of power—the executive—does not have the right to do this and no one even tries to make make society do this through the executive power... It is only here in our country in the delirium of the so-called democrats that the idea can appear that the president gathers together some circle of people called the constitutional conference and that they virtually adopt the Constitution. That is not only an absurd, ridiculous undertaking, it is a dangerous one. It attests to the fact that there are persistent designs to establish some kind of pseudodictatorial rule.

The most graphic expression of these attempts was the well known 20 March statement. The congress gave a clear political assessment of that. Unfortunately, people did not calm down and they are trying even more vigorously to accomplish what is in fact a coup d'etat. If the situation becomes heated the collapse of the Russian Federation and its "Balkanization" will inevitably begin. I am deeply convinced that the Yugoslav option has been and is being prepared for us and elements of it are already spreading to the Russian Federation. And in the long term it could also be extended to other states: Ukraine, Kazakhstan. It is already being tried out in the Caucasus. It seems to me that debate over the constitution is closely linked with Russia's "Balkanization."

And here we approach the fourth element: It is perfectly obvious that there has been a merging of interests of the familiar "collective Rasputin," which operates within, and the very powerful international financial groups which are trying to link individual economic regions of the Russian Federation to their system of global interests. Of course, Russia's collapse suits them. They will acquire a new economic area and put an end to their age-old enemy. And the fine Russian idea which arose at least 150 years ago will remain only a dream...

[Chikin] Ruslan Imranovich, the impression is that we are all covered by the bell jar of a supergovernment consisting of the forces of the world oligarchy, a supergovernment which calculates and models everything and pushes our ministers to take particular steps. This supergovernment can already be felt breathing down our necks...

[Khasbulatov] You are right, I can also feel it, but my colleagues do not all feel it against the background of the terrible danger looming over our country. I would like people to think more about state, national interests and about society. Yet here, you see, there are quarrels. In general we should be more resolute in uniting genuinely democratic forces so that everyone is united by a sense of terrible danger. For a year now I have been coming out with the idea of national consensus, national conciliation, the union of all our progressive forces...

[Chikin] That is the only sensible path for those who hold dear the Fatherland... We are now speaking of saving the country. But the security council which has been created in our country—the Supreme Soviet formed and approved it—is probably accountable in some way to the Supreme Soviet? But now responsible personnel are being reshuffled there and the nature of its activity could change, yet the Supreme Soviet seems to be uninvolved...

[Khasbulatov] Yes, the security council according to the law was formed by the Supreme Soviet and of course it is also accountable to parliament, although it was created under the president as a consultative organ. In practice its work has been neutralized and an attempt is now being made to remove it from the Supreme Soviet's control. Without the knowledge of the Supreme Soviet Skokov was removed from the post of security council secretary. Attempts are being made to replace him. But that is illegal. It would be more correct if the president asked the Supreme Soviet to remove the Security Council secretary. Then a responsible decision would be made. At any rate I want to remind you that the Security Council members can work as long as they are approved by the Supreme Soviet... That is further proof for you that the regime is sliding not simply toward bureaucracy but also toward a regime of personal power.

[Chikin] Rutskoy's 16 April speech made a very strong impression on society, he stunned people with facts, although many of them had already been in the press, and his speech gathered everything together into a terrible picture. Even Chubays and Poltoranin shuddered. But time is passing and people are not seeing the matter make any headway. And everything seems to have subsided. But somewhere Poltoranin roars at Shokhin that the denunciation will not save him, and then there is quiet again... So is the case making headway? And if it is not, then is the reverse effect of this revelation not operating? After all, murderous facts of the terrifying plundering of the country have been revealed, and essentially no one has denied them, but we cannot see any progress in the matter...

[Khasbulatov] Of course, in a normal state these people involved in machinations of this kind would probably have been removed immediately. In any country.

[Chikin] The Italian situation is developing before our eyes: The politician Andreotti, popular in the world, was obliged to resign as soon as he was touched by the shadow of the criminal world...

[Khasbulatov] But let us recall that President Nixon was removed from power by congress for what seemed a mere trifle: The headquarters of a rival party had been bugged with his knowledge. Imagine if President Nixon had announced at the time that he would personally undertake to investigate the Watergate affair. The American public would have died of laughing. Yet initiatives of this kind get through in our country.

Now for the essence of the matter. The Supreme Soviet is not being dismissed from this matter. We have created a special prosecutor's group and appointed the first deputy general prosecutor and several more prosecutors to investigate cases connected with corruption. Of course, we shall do everything to protect this group, so that no pressure is brought to bear on it. And enormous pressure is being brought to bear as though the task was set of ensuring that our prosecutor's office, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Ministry of Security are unable to level charges against a single official who had been caught embezzling. If he serves in the system of executive power that means he is under the president's patronage. The mafia have the following rule—preventing their man from entering the dock or if he does go, then he goes as a dead man...

It is hard for our law enforcement organs now, they feel gigantic pressure from the executive power at all levels... There are also attacks on the general prosecutor, blunders and setbacks are being exploited, a particular fuss is being made of what lawyers once said about the case of the state committee for the state of emergency, they want to exploit everything. And what does the replacement of the general prosecutor mean now? The entire system of the prosecutor's office will of course die and be taken out of commission.

The situation is very complex, very grave. Of course, there is powerful protection for those people engaging in corruption, theft, and particularly illegal privatization. What have they actually done? Our national wealth has been artificially cheapened by at least a factor of 50. After all, it is absurd: One dollar is worth a thousand rubles. Why is this being done? For the easy purchase of artificially underpriced national assets. For instance, we spent $100 million on creating an enterprise yet is is sold for 100 million rubles. And who stands to gain? A kind of thieving class of rich people is being created so that they can be relied on in the implementation of policy, what may be termed the social base of the support for the ruling class is being expanded by creating nouveaux riches. And the theoretical justification is: It is all the same to us how this new class arises, it is important that it supports us and defends its property... That is how the reforms process is being forced through.

[Chikin] Here society is being doomed for at least 50 years to live under conditions of criminal morality.

[Khasbulatov] Of course. Moreover, the majority of the population is doomed to poverty. All high-technology processes are disappearing, they cannot compete. Look, Volvos, Toyotas, and automobiles of other foreign manufacturers are already driving out our own automobiles. An entire industry is thus doomed to disappear. It will be just the same with the radio engineering industry... That is how they will start to "integrate" us. Intermediate technologies, backward, ecologically dirty technologies will be dumped here while our progressive technologies—and we have much that is valuable—will disappear. That is the kind of thrifty policy they have. I have probably not always been right when I said that we were dealing with incompetent people. They have enough competence when it comes to destroying progressive technologies and plundering national assets created over the centuries...

[Chikin] People are forming the impression that today there is an intensive attack on the Supreme Soviet and its leadership and that the intention can be seen to split up forces and set them against each other. Any methods are being used. In general guiles has become the norm in politics—I cannot recall this from Russian history... How protected is the power of the people? What are the Supreme Soviet's prospects of remaining in a state in which it can work and of completing its term in office?

[Khasbulatov] The Supreme Soviet will survive, of course, of that I have no doubt. But we need the support of our fellow citizens, our soviets, and everybody who thinks about the future of the fatherland. We need active defense. By which I do not just mean protection for me personally or for a specific official; for us defense means defense of the constitutional system and the Constitution.

The movement of committees for defending democracy and the Constitution is spreading throughout the country. This is a very noble undertaking, and moreover it has been engendered from below. It is very important that these committees operate vigorously by attracting as many citizens as possible. And needless to say we must explain our work and our activity. In fact the Supreme Soviet adopted a clear-cut stance from day one: Democracy and reforms that are realistic and serve the people's interests. I should say straightaway that we did not give the "thumbs up" to the plundering of our people. We rejected the current privatization program. Unfortunately the government deviated from the law on privatization adopted by the Supreme Soviet. If they had followed the law to the letter, every individual would at least have had a privatization account which would have been credited with 10,000 rubles [R] in January 1992, let us say, but this money would have been index-linked, and today every citizen would probably have R500,000 rather than R10,000—not a large sum, but nevertheless something to rely on in these hard times. This is what we suggested, and this is what we wrote into the law. But instead of this, Russians got vouchers. This, incidentally, is another reason for the current diversionary political campaigns. The government can see the bankruptcy of these vouchers, a gigantic swindle is being uncovered. They themselves don't know what to do with these vouchers. Therefore they are striving to divert people's attention.

Economic policy failures are also instituted through the president's edicts. Thus, for example, a large number of edicts were adopted just before the referendum. It will take between R5 and R13 trillion to implement them. This money is not stipulated in the budget. Where are we to find it? Now we are seeing an attempt to retreat from these promises, which is another reason why people are getting so hot under the collar. The Supreme Soviet is standing guard over the Constitution and the state, and it is also guarding the president himself. We are not against the president, we demand only one thing: Let's work in accordance with the Constitution and the law. If the laws do not suit society, let's change them, but only in a constitutional fashion. Success can only be achieved through lawful transformations.

[Chikin] Will the Supreme Soviet stand its ground—after all, it is being undermined from within...

[Khasbulatov] I read an article in PRAVDA and was surprised to learn that such a refined plan is being used to split the Supreme Soviet. I was alarmed by this. I had imagined that machinations of various sorts were afoot, but it never occurred to me that these intrigues were so elaborately constructed and so all-enveloping. Of course I am disturbed by these attempts to demoralize, buy off, and deceive the deputies... And, you know, at the top level, in full view of the entire population, we are witnessing haggling over jobs, apartments, and dachas. No power can allow its supporters to be bought in such a cynical manner.

Deputies have told me that when they voted on Ryabov's draft decree they were approached by apparatus staffers who said: Vote this way if you want that apartment; and raising the question of a permanent residence permit, they said: Vote this way and everything will be taken care of. This worries me very much.

I am also concerned by another question which cropped up in connection with the Travkin and Afanasyev initiative. The facts are these. In 104 districts, a constitutional majority of voters favored early elections for deputies. If the 104 deputies from these districts submit an application to consider their future, it seems to me that the Supreme Soviet will accept their resignation and that will be the end of the matter. I repeat that they are not obliged to do this, but they might act accordingly through ethical considerations.

[Chikin] Do you consider Travkin's motives to be justified?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, I see nothing bad in what he is doing. He has shown resoluteness in fulfilling the will of the people and the electorate. The presidium will announce fresh elections and new deputies will be elected.

There is another, more dangerous matter. Right now attempts are being made to work on a big group of deputies—about 250-300 people. They are being urged to tender their resignation from the body of deputies in order to disrupt the Congress' quorum. Bribery, blackmail, and threats are all being used; the most frequently used tools are flattery and promises of a job with prospects. Voters should have a clear idea about what lies behind these games. They should call their deputy to civic account, demand that he give an account of himself, and ask him to explain himself. This would help matters considerably.

[Chikin] Will the Congress go ahead as planned?

[Khasbulatov] A lot depends on the government. We wanted to devote the June Congress to the question of the socioeconomic situation in the country and the formulation of an economic program. If the government submits such programs to us, we will hold the Congress as agreed. There is no point in devoting it to the Constitution, for example, since we do not have a prepared draft and the other issues have not been prepared. We are therefore awaiting economic material.

[Chikin] Will you be going to the Constitutional Conference...?

[Khasbulatov] It depends which one you mean—I am told that three constitutional conferences are already planned... If you are referring to a conference, it seems to me that there is no point in using the word constitutional. It is a meeting of various officials, a conference which may be of assistance to the Constitutional Commission, the Supreme Soviet, and the president. Go ahead, hold your conference. But if there are attempts under the guise of a conference to found unconstitutional organs of any kind and turn them into constitutional organs, this must be condemned. To participate or not to participate is another matter altogether, but actions of this sort are to be roundly condemned.

[Chikin] What is your forecast—will the first 10 days of June go smoothly for the people?

[Khasbulatov] I think things will go smoothly, unless you are referring to the socioeconomic situation which is now very grave... The authorities certainly do not want to live in conditions of real democracy... Everything is moving in the direction of undivided rule... I recall our president once telling me that Bush said that he devotes 80 percent of his time to working with congressmen. I asked him: And how much of your time do you devote to that? He began to smile. You, I said, devote absolutely none of your time to congressmen... Of course, you do devote yourself exclusively to a chosen circle...

In democratic conditions things are tough for any authority and any president—he acts the role of father of the nation, reconciles conflicting sides, and rarely adopts the stance of any narrowly radical party. We have never had such a figure. In my position I am always trying to play the role of the peacemaker in a particular social conflict in Russia and the CIS in my capacity as chairman of the Interparliamentary Union. Sometimes I succeed, sometimes I don't. But good deeds, you know, are punishable. Right now I always feel that the spearhead of the attack is directed at the Supreme Soviet chairman. So you never know where to expect the blow.

[Chikin] How are you coping with this?

[Khasbulatov] Fine, I've already gotten used to it.

Khasbulatov Warns of Russia's Disintegration

PM2805151393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 May 93 First Edition pp 3, 4

[Article by Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet: "Is the 'Balkanization' of Russia Possible?"]

[Excerpts] **Three Alarming Issues**

Today there are perhaps three potentially explosive issues which worry Russia's population, politicians, and scientists. These are the possibility of a flare-up of hotbeds of civil war on the territory of Russia itself; second, the restoration of repressive methods of government and the establishment of sundry forms of despotism; and finally, Russia's possible disintegration. At the same time, these issues essentially represent the sole parameters within which both the reformation of the Russian state and the political struggle can occur. Strictly speaking, the state must have political and legal mechanisms which would curb the opportunity to participate in politics for individuals and organizations perceiving as possible, and even desirable, the path involving the collapse of statehood.

Let us examine one of these issues, which I raised in my previous article in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA (15 May 1993): How probable is Russia's disintegration, its "Balkanization?" Is this question hypothetical? What do many of our analysts and our fellow citizens think?

Imaginary 'Advantages' of Disintegration

Today, unfortunately, there are people to be found—not only beyond Russia's borders but also within the ruling elite and the structures of regional power—who believe that the disappearance of the Russian Federation as an integrated whole and the emergence in its place of a conglomerate of principalities and other quasi-state formations with weak links among them and replacing today's republics, oblasts, and krays is the way to improve political, economic, and even cultural relations throughout the region inhabited by Russians and their neighboring peoples.

Ultimately it is the federal bureaucracy which distributes the tax revenue collected from the territories of the Federation's components—and frequently does so to its own advantage. Vast sums melt into nothing like a candle's wax under its flame, outside the integrated budget process and beyond the Supreme Soviet's monitoring potential with the wave of a more or less senior functionary's hand. Could there be a more worthwhile task than getting rid of such an unprincipled state apparatus of federal departments?

People say that the country's economy would be better off if there is less power granted to state functionaries as regards dealing with property and monitoring its utilization. But they actually overlook the fact that contemporary Russian business—unless its activity is monitored by the state—would ship the entire country abroad as soon as it could and would exchange it for consumer goods ranging from flash cars to cheap alcohol.

Consequences of 'Balkanization'

As a matter of fact, it is quite probable that these selfsame deals would be struck by independent and "liberated" regional authorities even before the Russian merchants manage to do it.

True enough, the following problem arises: Will the majority of regions have anything to sell—especially those which process raw materials, bearing in mind that the extracting republics and oblasts will inevitably set (will be forced to set) world prices for fuel, ore, agricultural produce, timber, and so on. It is more than problematic whether the majority of producers would manage to operate in these conditions. The majority of the country's regions would be simply flooded by cheaper (and not necessarily better) goods from abroad. Who will survive—the strongest, or those who would exploit Russia's natural assets that were developed thanks to the currently forgotten integrated national economic complex of the USSR? This means, apart from anything else, that the development of today's fuel and energy regions, for example, would be based on investments from Russia's regions that are poor in natural resources.

It is, of course, advantageous not to repay the invested capital—not just financial and material, but also intellectual and "human" in the broadest sense of the word. But to what extent is this moral? To what extent does this promote the establishment of trust between various components of the Russian Federation, nowadays covertly or overtly claiming the status of state formations? Is it possible to establish any durable partnership relations without trust?

This is exactly how they think: To begin with, they say, we will deprive the Moscow bureaucracy of power, and then we will unite. We will determine the form of this union by ourselves and will delegate to the center whatever we deem necessary. But any more or less sensible politician or simply responsible person realizes that any deliberations about a possible future union in the wake of a divorce, as it were, is nothing but utopia. After all, there were hopes in the past that we would create the CIS in the wake of the USSR. And what happened?...

If it is intended to build a federation on new treaty relations following the liquidation of Moscow's power, one would like to know how conscientious are those who propose this development option—are they conscientiously confused about the consequences or are they conscientiously taking them into account?

Especially since it is obvious to everyone that, given the differences in the regions' starting conditions at the time they autonomously enter the world arena, the likelihood of conflicts emerging between them will be sharply increased. This danger will hang over all the formations remaining on the territory of today's Russia—at least until such time as historical memory will come into effect, indicating how and at whose expense the initial capital of distant and nearby "neighbors" was created.

The acute political crisis which we are now experiencing (artificially fanned by the Kremlin radicals) would be like a political heyday in comparison. We will instantaneously face the problem of controlling the arms and mass destruction devices which are in plentiful supply across Russia's territory. In these conditions the world community will not let itself remain an indifferent observer, watching events in the country from the other side of an iron barrier. True enough, nowadays there are more than enough Smerdyakovs [reference to character in "Crime and Punishment"] appealing to the "French" to instill order in Russia. But it is more than problematic whether the bulk of the Russian population will be capable of accepting the measures proposed by the world community. Nonetheless, the mighty West will probably be capable of sending "blue helmets" to Russia's regions to perpetuate in practice the "patchwork Russia" in its status as the raw material pantry of postindustrial countries. The centuries-old dream of the West—to resolve the "Russian question" once and for all times—will materialize.

That which will remain of Russia by this time will inevitably become the source of such disturbances which would make many people think of its past role as the "empire of evil" and leader of the communist world as nothing more than child's play. How aware of this are the Western world's leaders and ideologists who have for a long time, stubbornly, covertly or overtly, wittingly or unwittingly driven the crisis processes in Russia to exacerbation?

Of course, a great lot in Russia depends on itself, on the population's state of mind and its spirit. But even Dmitriy Merezhkovskiy wrote, already after the revolution: "Oh, of course Russia destroyed itself: It is to blame for nine-tenths of its own destruction, but nonetheless Europe is to blame for the other one-tenth. A man may be able to carry nine poods loaded onto his back, but the tenth pood will crush his bones." This actual "tenth pood" represents the "contribution" made by international financial and industrial circles. They have already divided Russia's economic regions into zones of influence and have elaborated the financial and economic mechanisms for "docking" them into the orbit of their own production complexes. And the Kremlin radicals, consciously or unconsciously, are accurately performing their assigned tasks.

I note with bitterness that the warnings about Russia's possible disintegration and its consequences are perceived by many fellow citizens as nothing more than emotional phrases uttered for public consumption at the height of political struggle. Generally speaking, anyone who tries to appraise the situation and make any forecasts has a thankless task. Frequently his moral sense protests and resists the words and rational conclusions prompted by his conscience. Here it is necessary to adduce weighty proof to back up what has been said.

Let us note that the situation prevailing today and the struggle being waged around Russia—"for" its unity and "against" this unity—cannot be described as a rare occurrence in the country's history. Not only in its entire thousand-years history, but also in Russia's 20th century history. A similar situation developed already following the February Revolution, when autonomous authorities started gradually emerging not only on the territories of today's independent states but also on the territory of Russia itself. Russia was close to disintegration. This incipient disintegration at the time was halted by means of the selfsame regime which was used to unify Germany under Bismarck's leadership in the last century—"Iron and Blood."

Many thinkers at the time produced different appraisals of the formally federal state which emerged from the remnants of the Russian Empire. Many of them found the actual form of federation in Russia inappropriate, just as many today find that the USSR's disintegration is inappropriate. But at the same time the majority of researchers assumed that any further division among the various oblasts of Russia and the USSR was unacceptable not only for the peoples of Russia itself but also for the whole world. The following was written in this context by Ivan Ilin, famous Russian thinker and nowadays more and more frequently remembered as founder of the Russian school of legal and state science: "Russia is not an accidental accumulation of territories and tribes, it is not an artificially devised 'mechanism' of 'oblasts,' it is a living, historically mature, and culturally justified organism which is not subject to arbitrary dismemberment. This organism... is a real bulwark of the Eurasian, and consequently the universal, peace and equilibrium. Its dismemberment would be a political adventure without historical precedent, and mankind would suffer from its fatal consequences for a long time to come.

"An organism's dismemberment into its components has not produced anywhere and will not ever produce either a recovery, or creative equilibrium, or peace. On the contrary, it always will be and has been a painful disintegration, a process of decomposition, ferment, decay, and universal infection. In this age of ours, the entire universe will be involved in this process. Russia's territory will seethe with endless squabbles, clashes, and civil wars which will constantly evolve into worldwide clashes. Russia will be transformed into a gigantic 'Balkan Peninsula,' an eternal source of wars, a great breeding ground of disturbances. A dismembered Russia will become the world's incurable ulcer."

Ivan Ilin displayed an unusual perspicacity when uttering these prophetic reflections. Let us examine the scenario of Yugoslavia's collapse, which is already applicable to Russia.

A Tragic Experience for Russia

[passage omitted] Which is the next target for the application of the aforementioned scenarios and mechanisms: Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the Caucasus? Could it be that these scenarios and mechanism are already being applied in these countries and regions?

Russia—The Next Stage?

Everyone is perfectly well aware of the fact that today we are actually reaping the fruit of the political processes which led to the USSR's disintegration. Unfortunately, the Union's disintegration prompted only a few politicians to draw conclusions. Despite the fact that the abundance of conflicts in different parts of our former country—Nagorno-Karabakh, Moldova, Georgia, Tajikistan, North Ossetia and Ingushetia, Chechnya—should have forced people to ponder the events. But this is probably a sign of man's mentality: Very few believe that misfortune can occur until it actually comes knocking at the door. Let us recall that, back in 1991, few people believed in the possibility of the Union's disintegration. Nonetheless, the USSR disintegrated. And today our states are painfully and laboriously trying to devise some kind of common levers for collaboration. They have been forced to try.

Of course, the Union's disintegration was predetermined by numerous political events and processes across the country's territory, the management (or at least the monitoring) of which from Moscow became less and less effective with each passing year of "perestroyka." Very few people at the time expected the poisonous flower of "independence" to bloom so surprisingly bright. Or that the integrated vast state would—very imperceptibly and at the same time thanks to "someone's" very skilled work—turn into the feeble semblance of some union between the "center" and the "republics," between the "nomenklatura center" and the "republics striving for democracy and market reforms."

Of course, not a single political process occurs without the political will of perfectly identifiable persons. Now it is up to historians to debate the issue of how much personal blame should be pinned on, for example, Gorbachev who, back in 1990, exercised such boundless power as would have enabled him to halt any separatist moves at local level. Virtually nobody has any doubts that the Union's disintegration was largely the consequence of the failed August "putsch." It is certain that those who signed the Belovezhskaya Forest agreement [setting up the CIS] only completed the work on the Union's disintegration which had already started—but these signatures had to be appended in a display of perfectly determined political will.

Nor can responsibility for the Union's disintegration be lifted from Russian representative organs or the First Congress of Russian People's Deputies which adopted the Declaration on Russia's State Sovereignty. After all, the "parade" of sovereignties began in our wake, including in the Russian Federation republics. It began with the lamentably famous philosophy encapsulated in the simple and garish sentence: "Grab as much sovereignty as you can swallow."

It is also necessary to self-critically note the fact that Russia's Supreme Soviet did not resist but, in many regards, indulged the actions by RSFSR executive organs aimed at weakening the Union. (I write this not to reproach those politicians but because today we are facing a similar situation and the time has come to learn the lessons from the tragic mistakes.)

There was another reason why the Union's disintegration became inevitable. I mean the "constitutional coup"—this is what it was in essence—against the Union's representative organs of power and its entire constitutional system. Of course, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in itself was quite a strange phenomenon from the viewpoint of developed parliamentarianism. It was probably even less of a parliament than the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Nonetheless, it was the Union's supreme representative organ which could have helped to monitor the activity of the Union's executive organs and primarily of its president who was constantly abandoning one decision for another.

Following the "September coup," the USSR Supreme Soviet's functions were, to all intents and purposes, reduced to zero: It was unable to monitor the activity of the Union's pseudogovernment which was formed at that moment in time, the formation of the Union's budget was made dependent on the republics themselves, and the questions of legislative settlement at Union level lost their significance. The very structure of the USSR Supreme Soviet (absence of a unified leading and coordinating organ) and the procedure for forming it from republic delegations rendered the Union "parliament" practically incapable of adopting any decisions whatsoever. It was only thanks to the personal standing of the leaders of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers that "permission" was kindly granted to take part in the Novo-Ogarevo process. Actually, the acting chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet was denied access to this process.

In general, it can be said that the Union's disintegration is largely the consequence of the destruction of the shoots of its representative system, regardless of whether we perceived it as bad or good at the beginning. The Union's disintegration is also a consequence of the habit of executive authorities in the republics and the Union at the time to decide constitutional issues in lobbies, behind closed doors, and within a narrow circle and then, with help from some arm-twisting, to push their decisions through the organs which should formally adopt such decisions.

As a matter of fact, these methods of administration, whose effectiveness is evident from the example of the Union's destruction, are also demonstrated by the presidential power in Russia. Since the Fifth Congress, there has been a steady stream of proposed decisions which obviously go beyond the Constitution's boundaries and are inevitably and gradually destroying it. Either "additional powers" for the president or the absolutely unconstitutional status of the acting head of government engaged in nothing more or less than the implementation of economic reform. Or the notorious "constitutional" (they forgot to add the prefix "anti") agreement between the "federal organs of legislative and executive power." Or the notorious all-Russian poll, which was supposed to have only moral consequences until it was held, but gave the president "constituent powers" once it was held. Or this "game" about the adoption of the "new new" Constitution.

How is it possible to believe the "constitutional reform" drafts proposed by the president's side when the ideologists of democracy (Ye. Bonner, for example) take the liberty of comparing the Constitution with "a roll of toilet paper" (where else in the world, one might ask, can people flaunt with impunity their scornful attitude toward the country's Fundamental Law?!). In all probability, the desire to have the new Constitution hurriedly adopted by sundry "constitutional conferences" is prompted by the wish to bring the Constitution which has minimal effect today back to the "constitutional regime" typical of the past 70 years of communist power.

The similarities between what is happening now and that which happened in the fall of 1991 at times appear as some threatening gibe by history. Let us recall that the speech by Constitutional Oversight Committee Chairman S. Alekseyev at the Fifth Congress of USSR People's Deputies actually provided the lever which was used to "push through" the decision on the "constitutional coup." Nowadays this famous "constitutionalist" allows himself without any hesitation to be used as the lever for pushing through a new constitutional coup.

To Avoid 'Balkanization'

Today it is extremely difficult to remain a political figure while being aware that your actions could be exploited to render Russia's disintegration inevitable. But today it would be even more immoral to keep outside the mainstream of events or resort to the French king's famous phrase: "Apres moi le deluge!" A solution must be found. And the quest for this solution must continue until such time as it is found. First of all it is necessary to conduct the reformation of the constitutional system strictly within the framework of constitutional legality.

The state system's activity since 1991 has shown that the separation of powers in Russia on the bases which were used as foundation for the institution of the presidency in 1991 could prove fatal for Russia. There are two alternative ways to change the situation.

The first is to sharply boost one of the branches of power—the presidential branch—and end up with dictatorship. But this is also an option. This is the option contained in the "new presidential" draft Constitution. But this option will inevitably lead (despite the sundry human rights proclaimed therein) to the emergence of repressive methods of administration and a totalitarian form of government. In the long run, such a Constitution is not viable, it is only for a "one-shot" use. We have been through all this not so long ago—is it worth going through it again?

The second option is realistic and truly democratic. It presupposes the creation of a system of state power with a more or less clearly defined system of "checks and balances," with an effective executive power (government) existing shoulder to shoulder with an influential parliament with strongly defined monitoring powers. Here the president cannot lead the executive power, although he does retain other important powers. The government is formed exclusively by parliament and is accountable to it. It is, moreover, obvious that this necessitates constant collaboration between all organs of state power in solving the main questions of determining and pursuing foreign and domestic policy. And unless the worst were to happen, we will yet end up with this system. At present the republics, oblasts, and krays stand on a principled constitutional position. This factor also has a sobering effect on the radicals who are striving to push through the "new new" Constitution using unconstitutional means. The adoption of the Constitution via constitutional means—through discussion at the Constitutional Commission, the Supreme Soviet, and the Congress—is already offering society an opportunity to be sure that the Fundamental Law will guarantee its interests on the basis of the fundamental democratic values of civilization and our own country's traditions.

Nonetheless, a topical task arises in practical terms: How to resist the pressure on Russia's representative organs of power and the attempts to eliminate Russia's actual constitutional system under the pretext of "struggle for the Constitution?" In other words, to safeguard the legal foundation of its existence and the representative nature of power and to ensure that the soviets function normally. Unfortunately, the parties involved in this struggle have not too many options left to choose from. What is needed is an active but conscious will by our fellow citizens, their real actions in defense of constitutional legality, and their protest against being duped—just as it happened during the preparation and holding of the 25 April referendum. In practical terms, we are facing the question of the constitutionality of actions by electronic mass media during the referendum campaign. The Constitutional Court will have to have its say on this matter.

It makes you laugh at times to hear people endlessly referring to the strong U.S. President, while "forgetting" to cite the example of activity by Congress. And yet Congress ratifies not only the personal composition of the government, but also the appointments of several thousand most senior federal functionaries and all ambassadors, and even monitors the President's bodyguard service. Incidentally, last year Congress "axed" more than 600 persons nominated by the President to various senior positions. And nothing terrible has happened—the U.S. President does not threaten to call a referendum, or to adopt a "new" Constitution for the Americans, or to disband Congress. Incidentally, the events occurring in Russia contain elements of tragedy, as well as of farce: The whole world is laughing at the escapades of the supreme executive power and is derisively and pitifully watching parliament (the Congress) and the Constitutional Court tolerate the virtually intolerable political clowning and the outrages against them.

In this sense there is certainly no "tug of war," as everyone claims. Generally speaking, how can there be a conflict between the different branches of power when the reality is: The executive power system accounts for 97 percent of the total number of people employed in state service, the representative power system (including, of course, the Supreme Soviet apparatus and its structures) accounts for 2.1 percent, and the judicial and prosecution system accounts for 0.9 percent. So, make your own appraisal of the "conflicting" sides' potential. In essence we are talking about a war declared by the presidential left-wing radical forces on representative power in general. Hence the slogan "Down with the Soviets!"

The soviets actually represent real people's power and rule by the people, we have no other representative organs of power or organs of direct democracy. Is it not disgraceful for the deputies and the leaders of organs of representative power to take the path of self-destruction, in effect the path of betraying representative power, under the pretext of "compromise," "flexibility," "consideration of the referendum lessons," and other collaborationist terminology?

In view of this terrible danger hanging over the country, over the cause of democracy and constitutional legality, all our fellow citizens, all public, trade union, and politician movements and their leaders must, at least for the time being, put aside their arguments and differences and rally around a shared progressive platform for the sake of the consistent implementation of economic and political reforms leading the people and the fatherland toward the flourishing of genuine democracy and the safeguarding of the citizen and his state. The state also needs our protection so that, in its own turn, it could protect the weak and unfortunate citizens who need help and attention from the state power. And yet we are destroying this power—it is being taken over by the mafia, the intriguers, the nouveaux riches, the bribe-givers, and the bribe-takers.

It has to be admitted: Both the referendum and the presentation of the "new new" draft Constitution have given a powerful impetus to regionalism. In these conditions, there is a growing danger of adopting a Constitution which will consolidate the processes of the collapse of Russian statehood. It would be much better to take the path of amending the current Constitution (the smooth path toward attaining a new constitutional quality). But, in any event, it is important to complete the work on finalizing and adopting the law on the mechanism for implementing the Federation Treaty, the work now being done by the Supreme Soviet Chamber of Nationalities and Yu.V. Skokov's working group. But this rational stance is hardly likely to suit those who are deliberately leading matters toward the state's collapse. Therefore everyone ought to participate in the work to finalize the contents of the draft Constitution so as to block the adoption of a Fundamental Law which would be dangerous for the country's fate. It must be adopted calmly, wisely, without hurry, in the firm belief that it is in line with the interests of all people, the interests of our fatherland's consolidation.

Yeltsin Takes Over Pension Fund From Parliament

LD3105132393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1310 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—President Boris Yeltsin ordered to create the Russian Federal Pension Service thus making a major step in denying the parliament an important financial instrument.

The existing pension fund under the parliament has been for long an apple of discord between legislature and the government and the latter wanted to take it over.

On Monday [31 May] the presidential press service reported that the president had signed a decree "On Managing Pension Provision in the Russian Federation". The new service is to pay pensions and accumulate finances for that.

The decree however, preserves the present-day rules for assessing the pension budget and its implementation is still to be reported to parliament. However, it will be the executive authority which will manage the finances.

Yeltsin instructed the government to request the Constitutional Court about the legality of legislative acts regulating the activities of the pension fund under the parliament. The move is aimed to strip the fund of the right to interfere into everyday activities of social security bodies, to pay pensions and implement other tasks which are the business of executive authority.

More on 27 May Presidium Session on Privatization

PM2805155193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 28 May 93 p 1

[Unattributed, untitled report]

[Text] A regular session of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government Presidium took place in the Kremlin yesterday under the chairmanship of Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

The agenda, as we reported the day before, included three principal questions. The central place was taken by the State Privatization Program for State and Municipal Enterprises in 1993. The draft of this program, presented by Anatoliy Chubays, Russian Federation vice premier and chairman of the State Committee for the Management of State Property, was approved in entirety. Participants in the discussion noted the need to give a specific form to the sector peculiarities of the enterprises being privatized, paying particular attention to the domestic economy's key sectors—the fuel and energy complex, transport, and the military-industrial complex. It is impermissible to privatize individual subdivisions of enterprises, which as a rule leads to the disruption of technological processes and economic ties. The privatization of facilities in the social sphere, medicine, education, and science and culture must be treated with extreme circumspection, thought being given above all to the social consequences of this process.

The increase in prices, the reduction in the population's living standard, and the political instability in a number of Russian regions have made it even harder to organize children's summer vacations. Ella Pamfilova, minister for the population's social protection, reported on the state of affairs in this important sphere and the measures being taken by the government.

The situation is not an easy one: From 1989 through 1992 the number of people and adolescents vacationing in camps and sanatoriums decreased from 10.5 to 6 million. This summer this figure will probably be 5.5 million people. The cost of passes is increasing sharply. While last year it was on average 5,500 rubles [R], according to various estimates it could be R50,000 or more this year.

True, half the cost of the children's summer vacation passes is paid for out of the Social Insurance Fund. This is R340 billion per season. But this is insufficient, because around R700 billion is needed. Part of the expenditure is covered by enterprises, but it is becoming increasingly difficult for them to do this.

The Republic Fund (R4 billion) has been formed to give assistance in carrying out the summer health campaign, but this is still insufficient, although this figure, allowing for indexation, amounts to R7.6 billion. The Russian president therefore instructed that another R2 billion be allocated for these purposes.

Participants in the Council of Ministers Presidium session also considered the question "On Clarifying the Procedure for Tax Control of the Resources Being Channeled Into Paying the Wages of Employees of Enterprises and Banking and Insurance Institutions."

Federal Ministries Will Contain Regional Representatives

LD3105123093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0946 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Polyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 31 May—The Russian Federation Government has decided to form councils [sovety] within the main federal ministries and government departments. They will be made up of representatives of the executive bodies of the republics within the Russian Federation, of krays, oblasts, autonomous entities, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg. These councils are being set up with the aim of "further improving regional policy in line with the Federation Treaty" and of "strengthening the coordination of the administrative bodies," the Russian Federation Council of Ministers resolution states.

The councils will have the functions of consultative bodies, and will be headed by the heads of ministries or their deputies.

Democratic Russia Aims for Pre-Election Coalition

LD3105124493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1138 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow May 31—The Democratic Russia movement, the mainstay of support for the Russian president among the array of political forces in the country, has decided to begin consultations with public and political organisations aimed at building an election coalition.

The council of representatives of the movement said in a statement released today that Democratic Russia "does not support attempts at creating pre-election blocs solely from above, because these attempts are connected with a risk of apparat degeneration of the democratic movement".

The council of representatives specifies that it considers "wrong and dangerous any attempts at creating pre-election blocs which can lead to the break-up of Democratic Russia".

Democratic Russia is the second political organisation after the Civic Union to begin specific work aimed at building a pre-election bloc from below.

Although a new constitution has yet to be adopted and it is difficult to forecast when it will be adopted, the majority of political forces think that new parliamentary elections are imminent either this autumn or—at the latest—next spring.

Yeltsin Supporters Plan To Convene New 'Russian Union'

LD3005210593

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 30 May carries a two-minute live report by announcer Yevgeniy Kiselev from the "Itogi" newscast. He outlines the two electoral systems: first-past-the-post and proportional representation with party lists and reminds listeners that the draft law on elections currently being drawn up envisages a mixed system.

Kiselev then reports: "We have learned from quite well-informed sources that the president's influential supporters are now actively pressing for the next elections to be conducted exclusively on the basis of voting for party lists. Accordingly, they want appropriate changes to be introduced to the draft law. Moreover, with this in mind, the president's supporters are planning to convene a constituent conference in mid-June—or maybe a congress of a new party or possibly a movement—provisionally called the Russian Union of 25 April. This is probably a hint that it will be a union of all those who supported Yeltsin at the referendum on 25 April. It is apparently precisely through party lists of the Union of 25 April that the president's supporters intend to elect their representatives to the new parliament."

Social Democrats Join Centrist Coalition

PM2805140193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28, May 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Linkov: "Centrists Prepare for Union"]

[Text] A broad coalition of centrist forces has come into view on the Russian political horizon. The other day the Russian Social Democratic Center decided to participate in its creation.

The Social Democrats see the coalition as a possible mechanism for the formation and expression of Russians' political will on the basis of a combination of democracy and patriotism. At the same time, they regard voluntarism and radicalism as unacceptable. The coalition's immediate tasks, as they see them, are to draw up an agreed federation-wide list of candidate deputies for the future new parliament and also to provide the political backup for consistent constitutional reform strictly in accordance with the norms of the existing Russian Basic Law.

Zhirinovskiy Favors Presidential Rule

MK2905121293 Moscow FEDERATSIYA in Russian No 59, 29 May 93 (signed to press 28 May) p 7

[Interview with Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal-Democratic Party of Russia, by Boris Levin: "I Am for the Third Option"—place and date not given]

[Text] Quite recently the Liberal-Democratic Party of Russia [LDPR] held its regular congress, which, according to its leader, Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, established the LDPR as a moderate right-of-center party, which is not for socialism, nor for communism, nor for capitalism, but for a normal state with an across-the-board pluralism, a multiparty system, a mixed economy, and a viable constitution that would be in line with present-day requirements and Russia's characteristics. Many readers of FEDERATSIYA are interested in how the leaders of various parties and movements assess the dramatic situation with regard to the struggle over the adoption of a new fundamental law. Our correspondent met with the LDPR chairman.

[Levin] Vladimir Volfovich, it has already become a cliche to refer to the well-known swan, the crab, and the pike [reference to I. Krylov's fable], but you would agree that the path toward the approval of a new fundamental law is so much reminiscent of this trite story.

[Zhirinovskiy] No, I would not agree. In this case, both the presidential and parliamentary teams are moving in one direction. If I may say so, however, they set different aims, so it is only natural that the process is being slowed down. I am familiar with both draft constitutions. Everyone argues over where and how they should be adopted, but I will tell you: both these versions have the same significant flaw, which was probably inherited from the Fundamental Law of 1924. I mean the notorious principle of dividing the country into national-territorial entities. It was cheered and applauded 69 years ago, but what was has come of it in the end? Today, we are treading on the ruins of a once great state, cities and villages are ablaze, people die, and this is not yet the end of the day, as the saying goes. Staffing the authorities according to that same explosive principle is bound to lead to yet another spiral of violence, which will detonate the country—and this will happen sooner than many people think. Had we nonetheless renounced this monstrous principle and agreed to a territorial division, then I would undoubtedly support the president' version—not, however, because it was drawn up by Boris Nikolayevich and his team, but because Russia needs presidential rule as never before. One thing is beyond doubt, however: A parliamentary republic is a much more progressive social system in terms of the level of democracy, but it is for the rich, developed countries, such as Sweden, France... In our conditions, however, it can only be presidential rule! As a matter of fact, this principle has been laid down in the LDPR's party member cards along with the principles of the rule of law, a multiparty system, and a mixed economy.

[Levin] Then, in your view, there will never be a place for parliamentarianism in Russia?

[Zhirinovskiy] There will be a place, but in around 15 to 20 years. History should not be urged on. Leaping from a tsarist monarchy and a CPSU diktat to a parliamentary republic in one fell swoop—you know, it is like going to a university from the first grade. No, let us finish the school of presidential rule first, and put off the graduation from a parliamentary university until the next century.

[Levin] Let's assume this is so. But wouldn't you agree that, one way or another, this or that constitution will nonetheless have to be adopted. The key questions—how, where, and by whom—are not yet off the agenda. What do you think in this regard?

[Zhirinovskiy] In a normal country, a constitution is adopted by the incumbent parliament; hence, it is the congress that should in principle have the last word. A constitutional assembly is a body that has not been provided for in any legislative acts. Are the consequences of the Belovezhskaya Forest not enough for you? An ideal option would be a national referendum. Electoral wards are ready, lists have been prepared... I am confident that the results would be the same as those of the latest voting.

[Levin] And the taxpayers will have to pay billions of rubles again? Isn't it simpler to put up with amending the current Constitution, a path, as a matter of fact, that is favored by many of our countrymen.

[Zhirinovskiy] We will again get muddled up. I am a lawyer, but even I sometimes fail to grasp what has been amended, when, and for what reason. Let us have new laws, a new fundamental law. The country has been broken up, but the old legislation remains intact! It is the legislation that should precede the development of the country, not the other way around.

[Levin] I recall an old joke about crossing an eagle and a snake, which produced two meters of barbed wire, but I have a different thing in mind: What may come of merging, as many people suggest, the parliamentary and presidential drafts into a single whole? What do you think it will be?

[Zhirinovskiy] This makes no sense. The parliament and the president would get equal rights as a result of this patchwork drafting, so what? Futile struggle, mutual reproaches, behind-the-scenes intrigues once again? No, what we need at present is a strong presidential authority. But one that would finally realize that the principle of a national-territorial division will ruin the country. I understand that I am repeating myself, but this is my agony, this is my cross...

[Levin] Are you for setting up guberniyas?

[Zhirinovskiy] You may call them whatever you wish. An oblast, a republic, but all of them should be called the same. The Volgograd Republic, the Syktyvkar Republic, the Tashkent Republic...

[Levin] What, has the USSR already been recreated?

[Zhirinovskiy] My party and I are arguing for the adoption of a new constitution and for the former republics of the former Union joining Russia voluntarily, not as national, but as territorial entities. I think that the recent bloodshed has clearly shown what the desire to draw back behind national borders may lead to.

[Levin] I understand that making forecasts is a thankless task, especially in politics, yet... In what, do you think, will the constitutional duel end?

[Zhirinovskiy] I think that after long, exhausting arguments the presidential team would invite several hundred deputies to the constitutional assembly and approve its own version with a number of parliamentary amendments. Another scenario is also possible—the congress, for its part, may invite representatives of the executive branch to attend its meeting. It makes no difference whether they meet in the Kremlin or at the White House.

[Levin] Do you think it is the optimum option?

[Zhirinovskiy] The most reasonable option is for all of them to resign, but it is clear that nothing of the kind will happen, so I do not see options that would be any better—so badly do we need a new fundamental law. A referendum would be even more advisable. In any other case, the legitimacy of the procedure under which the new constitution will have been adopted will be questioned over and over again forever. I believe that the readers of FEDERATSIYA are also fairly tired of this. In a word, I am for the third option—for holding a referendum and changing the principle of the country's national-territorial division.

Former Official Denies Connection to Investigation

MK2805100693 Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No 22, 26 May-1 June 93 (signed to press 25 May) p 1

["L.L."-signed interview with former Vice Premier Georgiy Khizha: "Believe It or Not"]

[Text] Vice Premier Georgiy Khizha's dismissal has given rise to many rumors and conjectures. Now a "canard" has been let out in the media that the former vice premier is under investigation....

We asked Georgiy Stepanovich for comments on the situation:

[Khizha] Right after the edict, of which I was nearly the last to learn, the newspapers and TV carried information of a rather strange content. They tried to make me out to be nearly a smuggler. The objective of such "reports" is quite clear—some folks cash in on compromising me, and then you can either believe or not.

It is known quite officially that in the government I was responsible for, among other things, military and technical cooperation and arms sales. I indeed was visited by an investigator who wanted me to explain to him some of the technical questions related to a case now under investigation. It is from this consultative meeting that they tried to make something sensational so as to cast a shadow on myself and lend it some criminal tinge. Undoubtedly I have nothing whatever to do with the case proper.

I cannot say anything definite at this stage about my future job. The president did not even think it was necessary to meet with me. [Khizha ends]

From the editors: We on our part are very interested in the disgraced vice premier's future. We are proposing to publish more extensive material on this theme in some of our next issues.

Procurator General's Office Protests Supreme Court Ruling

LD2805175093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1505 GMT 28 May 93

[By CRIME-PRESS correspondent Nikolay Semenenko]

[Text] Moscow May 28 TASS—Russian Deputy Procurator-General Eduard Denisov heading a group of state prosecutors at the trial of State Emergency Committee members sent a protest to the Presidium of the Russian Supreme Court against a ruling issued by the court's military collegium.

It will be remembered that the collegium requested the Russian Parliament to ensure independence of prosecutors participating in the trial.

CRIME-PRESS learnt at the procurator-general's office that the protest notes that "the court did not establish personal, direct or indirect interest of any state prosecutor (participating in the trial) in this case. Only these considerations can be taken into account under the law".

The protest also calls the court's attention to the fact that "it is possible to judge about legality or illegality of a preliminary investigation or a procurator's supervision over it only when quality of such actions is unbiasedly tested at trial hearings. This was not done in this particular case".

The protest notes that the state prosecutors describe the court's appeal to the Russian Parliament as the court's actual rejection of its independence and as a proposal to replace the judicial power with the legislative one.

Stepankov Interviewed on SCSE Trial

LD3005161993 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1820 GMT 29 May 93

[Interview with Valentin Stepankov, Russian procurator general, by Galina Zhulina; place and date not given; from a progran entitled "SCSE"—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Zhulina] Valentin Georgiyevich, I know that candor is not the most revered quality in politics, but when we talk about the State Committee for the State of Emergency [SCSE] we are entering that sphere. I will take a risk and ask you: What were the motives for publishing your book?

[Stepankov] We saw that the thoughts and ideas professed by the SCSE members had deep roots in our society, in our consciousness. It is a question which affected all layers of the population, and having delved into the details, the events, the facts, the evidence which had been gathered, we felt we should recount how things had been, and how they had taken place. Both Lisov and I, and the journalist who was working with us, understood that we were in a rather complex and difficult situation. However, we found a solution to the situation in criminal legislation. It authorizes the investigating procurator to divulge those facts which do not hinder the establishment of the truth.

[Zhulina] How do you regard the court's decision?

[Stepankov] There is an article in criminal procedure giving an exhaustive list of all the circumstances in which judges, procurators, or defense lawyers must be removed. That list cannot be turned or drawn on in order to remove the procurators taking part in this case. The court has no evidence, and the party requesting this has not presented any, to show that the nine state prosecutors in question have an interest in the outcome of this case. Instead of considering the essence of the request, the court found an option without foundation in procedural law, to appeal to another authority. This is at a moment when people are talking constantly about the independence of the court, and there are attempts... [changes thought] The court itself, as if acknowledging its own powerlessness, appeals to the legislative power asking for extra guarantees. Perhaps one day that will take place, with time. Today, however, we are living in a particular situation, and I do not think the court should fear that the procurators, who are prepared for the trial with their arguments, will prove that the charge is valid. A dispute with defense lawyers is a usual thing in a public trial. Instead of plunging into the trial, the court looks for a way around the situation. The state prosecutors taking part in the case did not agree with the court's conclusions, and today they have brought a protest which has been directed to the presidium of the Supreme Court. I do not know what steps the Supreme Soviet will take.

[Zhulina] There is a view that your book was supposedly printed or published precisely in order to somehow slow down, or perhaps even stop the trial. Such a point of view does exist.

[Stepankov] People have come up with many conjectures and suppositions. I want to say, however, that Russia and the citizens of Russia, and those who participated directly in the events—primarily they are Muscovites who live in Moscow and saw with their own eyes the blood on the streets, the tanks, the burning barricades, and so on—I think they have a right as citizens of the country to know at least the facts which we have established, what actually happened. In our book we do not assess who was to blame, or who was not to blame. It is for the court to do that, and we await and insist on this public trial.

[Zhulina] I want to ask purely as a citizen: What is behind this? Why are we still stuck in these political and legal intricacies?

[Stepankov] The court really did not understand this, whereas we had been through it. We have had dealings with them over a year and we know what sort of people they are, people like Lukyanov. They have all counted on politics, they have counted on it in order to escape. You ask them a direct question: Where were you at this time, why did you vote for the seizure of the White House? What does it matter if I voted or did not vote? White House? You signed at the Belovezhskaya Pushcha [where the CIS was created], you destroyed the union, and they try and dodge the question. No, guys. That will be another trial, in the Constitutional Court, probably, but you will answer. You sat and voted for the seizure of the White House where there were people, where the Russian president was. You understood that you would be seizing authority by force. They say what has that got to do with it, he is a traitor of the people.

That is, you know, when you make them talk about those things, they are helpless, they do not understand they will have answer for that.

[Zhulina] The helplessness of Lukyanov is rather strange.

[Stepankov] He simply has nothing more to answer. We have it all noted down to the minute. We have confiscated all the minutes from those talks about all the Kremlin phone lines, about everything. We have a mass of witnesses who saw it all. We have recreated everything in minute detail. They are afraid of this case. The statement of indictment, which is four volumes long, if that is made public and journalists are allowed to have their say, that will be the first defeat for them.

[Zhulina] Tell me, if you would: this is probably a question entirely within your domain. Since the investigation and the trial are taking place in Russia, would it be possible to alter the charge in such a way that the crime could be said to have been committed in Russia, in the State of Russia? Lukyanov, we have seen all those films, all the recordings where he says I will not acknowledge it, I do not want to know anything about it.

[Stepankov] We know his argument, that the Soviet Union is no more. First, the events took place on the territory of Russia, and so the case should be considered in the place where the crime was committed.

[Zhulina] Is Russia mentioned in the charge at all?

[Stepankov] Yes, it is, both the Russian Parliament and the Russian president are mentioned, its sovereignty and its independence, all of that, all of it is noted down. It will only have any effect when they get to work on the case.

Yeltsin Edict on Interim Provision on Rallies

PM2805120393 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 27 May 93 p 2

[Russian President's Edict no. 765 dated 24 May 1993 ratifying the Interim Provision on the Procedure for Notifying the Executive Organs of the City of Moscow of the Holding of Rallies, Street Processions, Demonstrations, and Pickets in the Streets, Squares, and Other Open Public Spaces in the City and text of Interim Provision]

[Text] Edict of the President of the Russian Federation

On the Ratification of the Interim Provision on the Procedure for Notifying the Organs of the Executive Power of the City of Moscow on the Holding of Rallies, Street Processions, Demonstrations, and Pickets in the Streets, Squares, and Other Open Public Spaces in the City

For the purposes of ensuring the rights of citizens to the holding of rallies, street processions, demonstrations, and pickets in the capital of the Russian Federation—the city of Moscow—I resolve:

1. To approve the subjoined Interim Provision on the procedure for notifying the organs of the executive of the city of Moscow on the holding of rallies, street processions, demonstrations, and pickets in the streets, squares, and other open public spaces in the city.

2. The present Edict enters into force from the moment of its publication.

[Signed] President of the Russian Federation B. Yeltsin.

[Dated] Moscow, the Kremlin. 24 May 1993.

Edict no. 765.

Interim Provision on the Procedure for Notifying the Organs of the Executive of the City of Moscow on the Holding of Rallies, Street Processions, Demonstrations, and Pickets in the Streets, Squares, and Other Open Public Spaces in the City, ratified by Edict no. 765 of the President of the Russian Federation dated 24 May 1993.

1. The present Interim Provision defines the procedure for notifiying the organs of the executive of the city of Moscow on the holding of peaceful (unarmed) rallies, street processions, demonstrations, and pickets (Footnote) (The terms "rally," "street procession," "demonstration," and "picket" in this Interim Provision are defined as follows:

"rally"—mass assembly of citizens for the public expression of an attitude toward the actions of individuals or organizations and events in sociopolitical life;

"street procession"—the organized mass movement of people along the pedestrian section or highway of a road or avenue for the purpose of drawing attention to given problems;

"demonstration"—public expression by a group of people of sociopolitical attitudes involving the use during the procession of placards, banners, and other visual means;

"picket"—the visual demonstration by a group of citizens of their attitude and views without a procession and the use of sound amplification) in the streets, squares, and other open public spaces in the city.

2. The notification of the holding of rallies, street processions, demonstrations, and pickets (hereafter known as mass actions) shall be submitted to the organs of the executive by the authorized representatives (organizers of the mass actions) of the labor collectives of enterprises, institutions and organizations, social organizations (associations), and the social initiative and individual groups of citizens no earlier than 15 days and no later than 10 days before the planned date of the event together with an extract from the minutes on the holding of the event in question.

In the case of a mass action with over 5,000 participants written notification shall be given to city hall, for up to 5,000 participants written notification shall be given to the prefecture of the administration of a district, and for up to 1,000 participants written notification shall be given to the subprefecture of a municipal district of the city of Moscow.

3. The notice given shall include the purpose, form, and venue of the mass action or the route to be taken, the start and end times of the action, the proposed number of participants, the surname, forename, and patronymic of the authorized representatives (organizers), their places of residence, date of submission of the notification, and contact telephone number. The forms and methods whereby public order is ensured by the authorized representatives (organizers) during the mass actions shall be stipulated as shall the organization of medical help and the use of sound amplification equipment. The people responsible for these areas of support shall be indicated.

The notice shall be signed by at least three authorized representatives (organizers).

The organ of the executive shall receive the notification and confirm the date and time of receipt in writing on a copy of it.

4. Notification of the holding of a mass action shall not be accepted by the organ of the executive if:

the action contravenes the principles of the Declaration of Human and Civil Rights and Freedoms and the generally accepted norms of morality and ethics;

the notification does not contain the commitment of the authorized representatives (organizers) to ensure the observance of public order and also if they or their authorized organizations have repeatedly failed to honor commitments assumed under previous mass actions;

the action coincides in form, place, and time but not purpose and aims with another mass action notification of which has been given previously or simultaneously within the prescribed deadlines;

the action poses a real threat to the normal functioning of enterprises, institutions, and organizations;

it becomes necessary to suspend the operation of passenger and rail transport because the route cannot be changed.

5. The organ of the executive is empowered, by agreement with the authorized representatives (organizers), to change the time, location (itinerary), and procedure for the holding of the mass action for the purpose of safeguarding public order and ensuring the normal working of transport, state and social organs, enterprises, and institutions and organizations.

6. It is recommended that the planning and holding of mass actions be avoided near high-tension power lines, high-pressure gas pipelines, large-diameter heating supply lines, installations which present a special risk of explosion or fire, and facilities and utilities under construction.

7. Mass actions shall be held in accordance with the aims set out in the notification, at the times specified therein, and in the agreed places (itineraries).

8. State and social organizations, officials, and citizens are not entitled to impede mass actions which observe the procedure laid down by this Interim Provision.

9. The authorized representatives (organizers) of the mass action shall not have the right to hold the action in question if notification was not given on time or was not accepted and shall be obliged to terminate the preparation of it.

10. Appeal against a refusal by an executive organ of power to accept notification of the holding of a mass action may be lodged with a superior organ of the executive power or the court.

Supreme Soviet

Khasbulatov Speech to Soviets Forum Previewed

PM3105135593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 May 93 First Edition pp 1,2

[Sergey Chugayev report: "R. Khasbulatov Calls For Revival of Soviet Power"]

[Text] As has been reported, the conference of deputies of all levels opens in Moscow 1 June. It is expected that over 2,000 representatives of the Soviets—from Supreme Soviet to rural soviet—will take part in the forum. However, the reason why the Supreme Soviet leadership intends to hold such a large-scale event on the eve of the opening of the Constitutional Conference remains unclear. Meanwhile, a partial answer to this question may be found in the synopsis of R. Khasbulatov's report at the deputies' forum which has been released in advance in the Russian parliament.

According to this synopsis, the speaker's address does not promise to be sensational on the whole. Rather the synopsis confirms that the positions which R. Khasbulatov adopted after he held on to his post with the communist factions' help and essentially became the mouthpiece of their interests remain unchanged.

It goes without saying that in the synopsis the government's economic policy is subjected to superficial criticism. However since the compilers of the report, like the majority of the Russian population, have a thoroughly vague idea of the present government's economic strategy at the moment, the criticisms are leveled mainly at the half-forgotten "shock therapy" policy. The synopsis contains the customary accusations against the supreme executive power that it is striving after authoritarianism and blanket accusations about corruption among the "occupants of Kremlin offices." Generally speaking, no change there.

The section devoted to the problem of adopting the new constitution is more interesting. Clearly it should be considered one of the main sections.

The report's main aim, it seems, is contained in two phrases. The compilers of the report suggest that R. Khasbulatov should "show that the adoption of the Constitution, even the most ideal one, will not give the people anything." And a highly original conclusion is drawn from the referendum results: "Strictly speaking, the people have banned the adoption of the new Constitution until spring 1995."

By all accounts, these phrases also contain the key to the answer to the question: Why did R. Khasbulatov and Yu. Voronin (and according to informed sources, they are the initiators of this conference) need to convene a meeting of the representatives of all the Soviets in Moscow? There is every reason for thinking that in this case we are dealing with an attempt to form some kind of alternative Constitutional Conference to seize the initiative from the president in the constitutional process. Furthermore, the aim of the people who came up with this idea is that a forum of all the soviets, unlike the Constitutional Conference, might even look like some kind of legislative organ capable when the opportunity arises of transforming itself into a sort of Soviet Constitutional Assembly. Thus the idea of the Constitutional Conference, which is supposed to represent all strata of civic society, is being countered by the idea of a conference of soviets representing 2 million deputies at all levels. And it is with the aim of creating a strong alliance of all the soviets—a bloc opposed to the president and the civic society which supported him in the referendum—that the 1 June conference is being convened, it seems.

Meanwhile, the idea repeatedly expressed by R. Khasbulatov and other leaders of the Supreme Soviet that the soviets are the expressers of the people's true interests may be questioned even on the basis of the synopsis of the speaker's report. Judging by the synopsis the soviets are going through a most profound crisis today. Last year, for example, 240 local soviets went out of existence and 70 percent disbanded themselves. The pace of this self-disbandment is increasing, as we can see. The number of sessions held last year was down by almost one-third compared with two years ago, thousands of sessions were postponed because they were inquorate, and the number of deputies fell by 48,000. "The 'soviet vertical,' unlike the 'vertical' of the executive structures, has effectively ceased to exist," the synopsis stresses. Such an extensive phenomenon can hardly be attributed merely to the intrigues of the executive. Probably it is more legitimate to speak about the natural extinction of Soviet power in Russia. And it is that which R. Khasbulatov is calling for an end to. His synopsis states quite literally that there must be a "revival of the activity of the soviets at all levels." It is hard to say what kind of response this slogan will find in the hearts of Russia's citizens, but there is no doubt that it will help to consolidate the deputies' corps. Especially since it is reinforced by the appeal not to adopt the new Constitution before 1995, which will undoubtedly guarantee that all deputies retain their powers, something which they are very anxious about.

Thus on the day that the Constitutional Conference opens in the Kremlin, its participants could well be confronted by the fact that the conference of the soviets has already managed to approve the parliamentary draft Constitution and that consequently there is no point in any compromise or in merging the two drafts into one. Events may then develop in two directions. The soviet conference could decide to submit its draft Constitution to the Congress which, as we recall, was scheduled by the previous Congress for June, a decision which has not been rescinded. And it could adopt its own constitution at the Congress having first extended the deputies' powers until 1995. However, this scenario seems unlikely. The president's position has become even stronger since the referendum. What is more realistic is that R. Khasbulatov and his supporters, using their version of the Constitution, will try to make the process of adopting the Basic Law as difficult as possible and delay the adoption of the final version of the Constitution until he fall at least.

The aim of this tactic is obvious—by fall, according to most forecasts, the economic situation in Russia should have deteriorated sharply. A crisis within the government cannot be ruled out. It seems that the opposition is also banking on these trump cards in its battle with the president.

The point of the idea of the Constitutional Conference proposed by the president is to enlist the broadest possible political forces in the work on the Basic Law. Including the deputies' corps by removing them from the rigidly controlled framework set by the Supreme Soviet leadership. However, that leadership, as we can see, preferred the path of deepening confrontation because it clearly did not want to lose control over the legislators. Today the option which until recently was regarded as quite feasible and the best—that everyone should discuss and adopt an agreed draft Constitution at the Congress—may be considered completely out of the question. The leaders of parliament intend to fight for their draft Constitution, the president for his, while seeking support among the components of the Federation. At the moment there are no prospects that the rift will be healed, and the situation is beginning to become increasingly reminiscent of the Novo-Ogarevo process.

Conference of People's Deputies Begins; Khasbulatov Speaks

LD0106073693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0650 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun—The all-Russia conference of people's deputies of soviets at every level began today in the parliament building in the capital. Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, is delivering a speech "on enhancing the role of soviets of people's deputies in the process of preparing and adopting a new constitution of the Russian Federation."

The development of local self-government "is very important for the development of democracy," the parliamentary speaker told a news conference yesterday. This is the principal goal of the conference. "People's initial contact with authority is in the form of local bodies," Ruslan Khasbulatov stressed. In his opinion, special legislation on local authorities is essential. Elected local bodies "are the bedrock of democracy; they oversee the executive's activities and compliance with the law." Ruslan Khasbulatov told journalists that "there cannot be a strong executive without strong elected authorities."

Russian Federation Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy is taking part in the conference.

Khasbulatov Attacks 'Corrupt Officials'

LD0106094393 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0800 GMT 1 Jun 93

[Report by Mayak Radio parliamentary correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy]

[Text] [Ruvinskiy] I promised our radio listeners in the morning "Panorama" newscast that we would tell them about what is happening at the conference of deputies from various levels which opened today at the parliamentary center in Moscow. Ruslan Khasbulatov opened the conference and made a speech. Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy is also present at the conference, and his appearance was greeted with applause in the hall. Khasbulatov gave a speech which contained somewhat fierce attacks on the government and the executive power in general. Here is an excerpt from his speech:

[Begin Khasbulatov recording] One of the main reasons for the smear campaign against the soviets and deputies at all levels is that corrupt officials want to protect themselves against possible exposure and the inevitable responsibility for the illegalities and abuses that they have committed. In fact, they wish to deprive the public of the lawful right to defend themselves against corrupt and thieving bureaucrats, against those who line their pockets by cynically and brazenly plundering public property.

Civil servants have in recent times actually ceased obeying even the government. They uphold only the selfish interests of their own bureaucrat class.

During the last year, 1992, and the first half of this year strange things—to put it mildly—have been taking place here, to the amazement of right-thinking people not only in this country but far beyond it as well. First, the worse the economy and the living standards of most people get, the greater the effort made to convince us that things have already begun to stabilize, that the most dangerous stage of the crisis is over, and that we can look to the future with optimism.

Second, the authorities devote most of their energy and time to politicking and to propaganda campaigns in which virtually all members of the government are directly involved, despite the urgent need to concentrate on the economy and economics; industry is in danger of losing its ability to meet even the most elementary needs of the public.

Third, the more they talk about democracy, the more we see power concentrated in one pair of hands, the greater the contempt shown for elected bodies and the judiciary, the tougher the line taken against the opposition, and more the threats of action against those who dissent, against those who do not support the overall direction.

Of course, these are not the only oddities, if one can describe them like that, in our life. We meet them at every step. Promises are dished out left, right, and center to get support in elections and referendums, and then are instantly forgotten. Peaceful demonstrators are deliberately beaten up and then instantly accused of being responsible for the clashes with the militia that took place. The mass information media are subordinated to one branch of power, yet it is asserted that they are the most free in the world. There is talk of civil peace and accord, but what is actually done serves to whip up the situation, to divide up people, our very own citizens, into friends and enemies, with incitement and violence and so forth.

The public is not yet sufficiently aware of the reasons for such absurdities, but the main reason is the confrontational policy of the right-wing radical forces, the confrontational policy engendered by the bankruptcy of the course of reforms. [end recording]

[Ruvinskiy] I should add that the parliamentary chairman also voiced strong opposition to the process of privatization, and his personal criticisms of Yeltsin were greeted with applause in the hall. True, those present in the hall also roundly applauded Khasbulatov's statement that there are people capable of giving a worthy rebuff. The Supreme Soviet chairman also touched upon the recent referendum, saying that the referendum had inflicted a blow against Russian statehood and that, in his view, there is every justification for declaring the referendum results invalid, given that the mass media were not objective in the run-up to the vote. The session is continuing its work.

Further on Khasbulatov Speech

LD0106102293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0753 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun—The representative authorities are the foundation for the development of the democratic process in the Russian Federation, Ruslan Khasbulatov stressed in a report delivered today at the all-Russian conference of deputies belonging to soviets at all levels. "A strong executive branch is impossible without a strong representative branch," he said.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet asserted at the same time that the executive establishment has effectively "usurped" all power in the country. "The administrative establishment," Ruslan Khasbulatov believes, "is no longer obeying even the government, but is upholding its own selfish interests."

The chairman of parliament called on the deputies to establish effective cooperation between the parliament and soviets at all levels. He advocated the drafting of legislation on local self- rule, which he considers to be "the basis of democracy in any state." Ruslan Khasbulatov stressed the importance of intensifying the supervisory functions of the soviets which, as he put it, "it is difficult to overestimate."

According to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, the soviets are in need of renewal. The body of deputies, he feels, "is greatly inflated."

Analyzing the work of the soviets, Ruslan Khasbulatov criticized them for "a certain passivity." He recalled that they are holding fewer sessions and relaxing their supervisory work. Many sessions have to be postponed because of a lack of quorum. The head of parliament stressed that the soviets "have a duty to mobilize broad social sectors of the public in support of reform."

Agreeing that the constitution "needs changing," Ruslan Khasbulatov accused the presidential side of attempting to "undermine the authority of the legislative branch" and "preventing it from participating in the adoption of the constitution." People's deputies can and must take part in the constitutional conference being convened by the president, Ruslan Khasbulatov said. At the same time he expressed fears that the constitutional conference "might be transformed by decree into a constituent assembly." This would "amount to a direct attempt at a coup d'etat," he said.

The lawmakers advocate constructive cooperation with the executive branch, Ruslan Khasbulatov said. In drawing up their approach, they are striving to heed the position of local soviets. He disclosed that the draft constitution was being discussed in over 70 regions of Russia, by soviets at various levels. The debate is a vigorous one, but there is a view that both drafts "need further work."

According to the head of parliament, "a single draft of the Basic Law is hardly likely to be achieved." Clearly, he said, "whether we like it or not, we will have three drafts." The first one is the presidential one, which the president is entitled to put to a referendum. But the Supreme Soviet also has a right to defend its draft, which, in the words of Ruslan Khasbulatov, "is more in keeping with the principles of democracy." The chairman of the Supreme Soviet spoke about the existence of a third draft which reflects socialist and communist ideas. No matter what one's subjective feelings about this draft might be, "are we entitled to restrict the authors' right to express their views?" he asked. So, the speaker concluded, "we will have the opportunity to submit three drafts for debate." He stressed that in doing so all the versions had to first be discussed in a peaceful, nonconfrontational way.

Returning to the tasks of soviets at all levels, the head of parliament acknowledged that the Supreme Soviet "has been distracted by federal problems and has given little attention to local soviets." Noting that the confrontation between the two branches of power is taking place, by and large, at the federal level, Ruslan Khasbulatov noted with satisfaction that the picture looked different at the local level. He called for the development of cooperation between local authorities for reform to succeed.

"The representative branch enjoys real support from the public. No decisions can be adopted unless its views have been taken into account," the chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet said in conclusion.

Parliament Should 'Dissolve' Government

LD0106114093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 1 Jun 93

[Text] Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy believes that the conference of deputies from soviets at all levels which is taking place in Moscow at the initiative of parliament head Ruslan Khasbulatov should instruct the Supreme Soviet to dissolve the present government without delay. He stressed that the time for talk, criticism, and polemics has passed. We must unite around the idea of people's power; solidarity is needed, he said. Rutskoy declared that he would stick by his position, no matter what the cost to him personally, INTERFAX notes.

Khasbulatov, Rutskoy, Pochinok Cited

LD0106122693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 1 Jun 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast; passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent L. Ioffe] Soviet power possesses great forces, but not as great as one could wish for. This was the main theme of Khasbulatov's speech at the conference of deputies of all levels. He said that he is not afraid of attempts to split the Supreme Soviet and its leadership.

[Khasbulatov] "We will get medical treatment for certain members of the Presidium."

[Ioffe] The speaker accused all levels of the executive estate of corruption and the usurpation of powers from the representative estate. The results of the referendum can be perfectly well disputed in the Constitutional Court since they were brought about by the media. Furthermore:

[Khasbulatov] "I am not saying this at all with a view to writing off the referendum or to encourage applications to the Constitutional Court and so forth. I am demonstrating my analytical capabilities and nothing more."

[Ioffe] Khasbulatov assessed the bloody May Day in Moscow as an assault by the special-purpose police on an unarmed demonstration. As far as difficulties in the constitutional process are concerned, here the culprit is well-known.

[Khasbulatov] "Such reproaches should primarily be addressed to the chairman of the constitutional commission, who, instead of posting daily decrees, should have been actually heading the work of the constitutional commission to provide the state with a new constitution. [applause]"

[Ioffe] The speaker considers a constitutional conference to be permissible but only as a consultative body. Khasbulatov does not believe in the evolution of a unified draft but that three have to be reviewed: the presidential-tsarist one—this is the speaker's assessment; the parliamentary-republican one; and, as a democrat, he believes that the supporters of a communist state should also be able to put forward their draft. Then the debates ensued.

[Announcer Valeriy Vinogradov] Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy took part in the debate. He said that it was difficult to add anything at all to the speaker's speech. He called the presidential draft constitution dictatorial and, as a practical measure, proposed the dissolution of the government, a load of out-of-control political adventurers, end quote. [no reference to beginning of quote as heard]

[Correspondent K. Belov] Even before the conference, in an interview with journalists, Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy supported Khasbulatov's idea of holding a referendum on the three drafts of the new constitution.

[Rutskoy] "Society lived for over 70 years under a communist system of government. This is quite a long time. A quite large part of the population, nevertheless, retains its standpoints and principles. Therefore we could put forward three draft constitutions for a referendum."

[Belov] But not all the participants in the conference agree with this idea.

[Aleksandr Pochinok] "One can only shrug one's shoulders when the chairman of the Supreme Soviet has even set the agenda for the possibility of returning to a communist draft constitution which he fought against for four years, which he has fought against, beginning with his election manifesto and ending with his sessions and congresses. Again, this is a very sharp step backwards. This is an attempt to go against history, in the face of progress and in the face of Russia's interests. Well, is this really possible?"

[Belov] The chairman of [word indistinct] doesn't approve of the aims for which the conference of soviets of all levels was convened.

[Pochinok] "An attempt is being made to set up a party of soviets, a rigid party, evidently a splinter of democratic centralism, the subordination of the minority by the majority, a struggle against dissidence. If you don't like our opinion, leave, take off your badge, and, basically, you need medical treatment. You see? This is inadmissible."

Khasbulatov Comments Summarized

LD0106090693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0853 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Russian parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov called on regional legislators on Tuesday [1 June] to intensify work as the soviets of people's deputies "are the basis of the development of the democratic process in the Russian Federation".

Addressing a meeting of lawmakers, the speaker accused the presidential authority of usurping all power in the country for the sake of "selfish interests".

Khasbulatov blamed regional soviets for "certain passiveness". He said the number of sessions is going down, legislators often lack a quorum, the controlling functions of soviets are weakening.

The speaker called to increase the controlling functions of the soviets, adding that the importnace of this can "hardly be overestimated".

The soviets are "called to provide reform with support of wide social strata of the population", he said.

Legislators Agree To Deny Quorum to Congress

LD0106101393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0956 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow, June 1 (TASS)—300 legislators have agreed to cancel their parliamentary mandate and thus deny a quorum to the conservative Congress of People's Deputies if it refuses to consider the final draft constitution, according to head of the presidential staff Sergey Filatov.

He told reporters on Tuesday [1 June] that he does not rule out the adoption of a new basic law by the congress, but confirmed that the congress may become incapable of adopting any decisions if the mentioned legislators abandon it.

He dispelled fears that the Constitutional Conference convened by the president may develop into an assembly with the right to adopt the new basic law. "I am saying that not to calm down the opposition", but to remind that the conference is convened to work out the final draft and decide on how to adopt it.

Khasbulatov Opposes Speeding Up Constitution's Adoption

LD3105164793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1634 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov is against speeding up the adoption of a new constitution and believes a new Basic Law can be passed in 1995 or later.

He told reporters on Monday [31 May] that a new constitution can be adopted by a newly-elected parliament or by the current composition of the Congress of People's Deputies before its mandate expires in 1995.

"By the time the mandate expires the people's deputies can adopt the constitution by themselves without artificially accelerating the process", he said.

Although the speaker believes that the adoption of a "fundamental constitution is premature" now, he still said he "wishes to reach civil accord and an early adoption of the constitution". He does not rule out that a nationwide referendum may be held for the purpose, however he did not specify the time and proposed to add a third draft to the questionnaire.

"The Supreme Soviet is ready to prepare and hold a referendum on three draft constitutions", he said, explaining that the three drafts are to reflect the three main political trends in society. The first one comprises supporters of President Boris Yeltsin, the second one - the centrist forces and the third one - socialists and communists.

Boris Zolotukhin, deputy chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Legislation, told TASS that Khasbulatov's proposal was made in order to deny a majority of votes to any of the three drafts.

"I want to stress that if three drafts of the constitution are submitted for the referendum it can be definitely predicted that none of them will get over a half of votes of the electorate" which are necessary to adopt a new Basic Law, he said.

Co-author of the presidential draft constitution Sergey Alekseyev qualified Khasbulatov's proposal "as a purely political step".

The parliament chairman refused to give a clear answer on whether he would participate in the Constitutional Conference convened by the president on June 5. Although he believes "an exchange of opinions to be fruitful" and sees "positive moments" in the presidential draft, the adoption of a "fundamental constitution is premature" and the Constitutional Conference "would hardly arrive to a single draft", according to him.

Khasbulatov denied rumours that the Conference of Legislators of all levels which he is convening on Tuesday would become "a parallel congress". He said the conference is necessary "to discuss problems of local self-government which are important to strengthen the power of the people and avoid dictatorship". The parliament cannot solve them by itself and needs the help of local authorities and the government, he added.

Ryabov Says 'Split' in Parliament Leadership Growing

LD3105163993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1512 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The split in the leadership of the Russian Parliament, signalled by Deputy Speaker Nikolay Ryabov a week ago, is growing.

On Monday Parliament Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov clashed with another presidium member, Aleksandr Pochinok, over "the management style" of the parliamentary leadership. The dispute resulted in a two-hour closed-door meeting "which was to solve certain personnel problems regarding the top leadership of the Supreme Soviet", TASS learned from reliable sources.

The only result of the meeting which became known to TASS is that another closed-door meeting on the same problem will be held this week when all members of the Parliamentary Presidium are in Moscow.

The dispute between Presidium members emerged during a routine meeting on Monday when Khasbulatov reprimanded his colleagues for discussing important issues without him.

But Pochinok, chairman of the Parliamentary Commission on Budget, plans, taxes and prices, fired back accusing the speaker of convening a conference of legislators of all levels on Tuesday [1 June] "behind the parliament and its presidium" who still do not have any information even about the agenda of the meeting.

Deputy Speaker Nikolay Ryabov was the first to signal the split in the leadership when he opposed Khasbulatov and asked the parliament to support the idea of President Boris Yeltsin to hold a Constitutional Conference.

Khasbulatov confirmed that the split in the parliamentary leadership exists. "It existed in parliament at all stages", he told reporters on Monday, adding that nevertheless "we, in general, find correct solutions. It is a working parliament."

The speaker denied rumours he is going to resign, adding that complicated circumstances do not allow him to abandon the post.

"In such difficult conditions this (resignation) would mean a treachery, but in more quiet circumstances I would do that", he stressed.

Parliament Session Said To Discuss 'Top Leadership'

LD3105161793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1412 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow, 31 May—Today's sitting of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet opened with a reproach from Ruslan Khasbulatov to the members of this body. The speaker asked his colleagues to inform him in the future "of all meetings and conferences in which they take part," probably alluding to the fact that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet has recently preferred to discuss important issues of domestic and foreign policy in a small group and in the absence of the chairman of parliament.

Instead of an apology, however, there followed an outburst from Aleksandr Pochinok, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Committee for Budget, Plans, Taxes, and Prices, who accused Khasbulatov of preparing a conference with national, regional, and local deputies—planned for tomorrow—virtually behind the back of parliament and its Presidium, which still does not have any information on the agenda of that meeting.

The Presidium members next moved on to considering the actual points on their agenda, after which a closed sitting began. This closed sitting, it has been learned from well-informed sources, will discuss problems related to the adoption of a new constitution as well as "certain personnel issues concerning the top leadership of the Supreme Soviet."

Parliament Favors Single Draft of Basic Law

LD3105101893 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0900 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] The Russian parliament has already received conclusions from 65 republican, kray, and oblast soviets concerning the progress of the constitutional process. ITAR-TASS reports that this was announced by Valentin Agafonov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet, when he spoke in the White House in Moscow today at a joint meeting of experts from bodies [subyekt] of the Russian Federation called to consider proposals for the draft of the new constitution.

Valentin Agafonov said the Supreme Soviet favors coming up with a single draft of a new basic law which will take into account the interests of the subjects of the Federation. He also said that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet has not yet received an invitation to take part in the work of the constitutional conference due to open under the auspices of the Russian president on 5 June.

Regional Affairs

Further on Khasbulatov Visit to Samara, Saratov

Proposes Referendum on Constitutions

LD2805185093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 28 May 93

[Video report by Zhdanova in Samara; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Russia must be one and indivisible. The guarantee of preserving statehood lies in the strictest observance of the Federation Treaty, stated Ruslan Khasbulatov today at a session of Samara Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. The parliament chairman presented an analysis of the social, political, and economic situation in society. Answering deputies' questions, the Supreme Soviet chairman promised state monopoly on sales of alcoholic beverages and stated that, contrary to common belief, there is no power struggle at the top; the matter is merely that one branch of power wants to topple the other. He failed to clarify, however, who is after who. He also warned of the danger of totalitarianism.

On the main issue—drafts of the constitution and procedures for its adoption—Ruslan Imranovich suggested that the parliament should propose to carry out, in November or December, a referendum on the three drafts: the presidential one, which he believes to be supported by a radical minority; the parliamentary one, which is backed, in his opinion, by a healthy majority; and the third one reflecting the interests of parties and movements of a socialist and communist hue.

[Khasbulatov] I want to put forward and be a leader of a constitution of a parliamentary republic [as heard] Do I have such a right? Yes I do, just as the president does.

Speaks to Oblast Soviet

LD2905024593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1700 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Today the head of the Russian parliament, Ruslan Khasbulatov, took part in the discussion of the draft constitution at the session of the Samara Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies. Correspondent Lidiya Krechetova reports.

[Krechetova] Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov arrived in Samara last night. He got straight in there this morning by taking part in the work of the oblast soviet, which included the examination of the drafts of the Russian Federation's new constitution in its agenda. Before his speech, Khasbulatov warned that the aim of his visit to the oblast was not so much to make a speech but to listen, understand, and draw lessons from what was said.

Nevertheless, Ruslan Imranovich devoted the greater part of the two-hour period allocated for this point on the agenda to outlining his position on the drafts of the new constitution and answered questions. He said in particular:

[Begin Khasbulatov recording] At present I am very concerned by this question: that the supporters are, it seems to me, trying to play the regional card. On the one hand, there are the oblasts and the krays, and on the other, the republics. In my opinion, this is all leading swiftly to the collapse of the state. One must either agree entirely with the federation treaty—and we have not changed a single thing in it—if we want to have a state. We have to ask ourselves the question: What are all these interregional talks, various gatherings, meetings, and agreements for? For maintaining unity, integrity, and indivisibility of the Russian Federation? [words indistinct]

Of course, we can say straight off that the president has been seriously weakened and that pressure can be put on him. But, excuse me, presidents and parliaments come and go yet the state has to remain and is remaining, and the people are remaining. The historic point has probably come now when the last thing we should be thinking about is our personal position and at long last more about...[changes thought] Will there ever be a time when we think about the fatherland, the state? [end recording]

[Krechetova] Those taking part in the session listened to the head of the Russian parliament as well as several people's deputies. They adopted a resolution which mainly dealt with a draft that was prepared beforehand. It suggests in particular that the Russian Supreme Soviet draw up a single draft constitution based on the two drafts and publish it for nationwide discussion. One of the main conditions in the resolution is that equality of all subjects of the Russian Federation must be established for the adoption of a new constitution. Khasbulatov plans to visit the oblast's rural rayons tomorrow.

More on Speech to Soviet

PM3105150193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 93 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Ruslan Khasbulatov: Constitution Cannot Be Constructed by Blackmail"]

[Text] R. Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, has addressed a session of the Samara Oblast Soviet.

In his speech he recalled in particular that three draft constitutions were submitted to the Sixth Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies. Apart from the official draft, there was one other version (it was not associated with the president at the time but had been put forward seemingly as an initiative by Shakhray, Alekseyev, and Sobchak). Finally, a third draft was proposed by a group of Russian Communists. In all there were around 20 drafts during that period. The Congress decided to unite all the best points of the other drafts in the official draft.

The speaker of parliament went on to dwell on the Federation Treaty, which was successfully signed because it was based on the principle of the socioeconomic equality of all Federation components—republics, oblasts, and krays. And the rights of these components cannot be further developed or expanded without violating the integrity and unity of the state. That is why it is necessary to agree absolutely exactly with the Federation Treaty, without making any substantive changes to it. Presidents and parliaments come and go, but the state and the people remain. That is why we should today be thinking least of all about our own personal position, and most of all about the fate of the state.

Industry in Russia today is collapsing, and the social position of people—particularly the elderly—is deteriorating. We are starting to lose our young generation and our children. Kindergartens, creches, and recreation centers have begun to disappear. Sick young men are coming to serve in the Army. We must think about these issues rather than dragging society into a debate on the Constitution, thereby distracting attention from the sore points and the unforgivable failures in implementing economic reform.

The current Constitution could for several years to come fulfill the role of a transitional version of the fundamental law—following sufficiently constructive changes to it. But we have now been drawn into a constitutional race, and so we must be very responsible in our attitudes to the constitutional process.

Following the referendum, academics and specialists have shown that society now consists of three social strata. There is a minority geared to radical transformations and inclined to support the executive's autocratic impulses. It supports the latest presidential version of the constitution. This group's social support comes from a small section of new entrepreneurs, including criminals. The majority advocates socially oriented reforms, and a strong role for the state. These forces might support the constitution of a parliamentary republic. And, finally, the third section of the population consists of socialist- and communist-oriented social strata. And it is quite possible that this section is even bigger than the first section, which adheres to pro-presidential positions.

If society consists of these segments, why should we not have a referendum on the three constitutions? This would be the classic form of the fullest democracy in society. The social forces backing parliament—just like those backing the president—have a legal right to put forward a constitution of a parliamentary republic. This is the version best suited to the conditions of real federalism.

Our country traveled a very long road of development at a time when communist ideas prevailed. And, clearly, many people still believe in those ideas... In a democratic society we do not have the right to deny them the opportunity to express their views. We must also allow this section of the population to submit a constitution and hold a referendum on it. All the more so as such a draft constitution was submitted to the Congress.

Thus, large groups of people united in these three philosophical areas could submit three draft constitutions which could be put to a referendum in November-December. We must not have solely the presidential version of the constitution imposed on us by blackmail. I advocate a referendum. We have to hear people's opinion on how they would like to see their state and their fatherland. Attempts to bring in a constitution by unconstitutional means should be condemned. No constitutional conferences or constituent assemblies aimed at adopting a constitution by edicts or decisions are permissible. They will be unconstitutional and null and void. Adopting a constitution by unconstitutional means would be to condemn the state to ruin. How can we hope to fight crime if top officials do not consider it mandatory to carry out the existing Constitution? Perhaps this is being done for a special reason. So as not to have an investigation, for example, into the instances of corruption reported by the vice president.

The elaboration of the constitution is now a matter for every Russian citizen. Nobody should avoid this most important issue, on which the fate of the state depends.

Tours Defense Enterprises

LD2805170493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1530 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Belyakov]

[Text] Samara, 28 May—The first day of Ruslan Khasbulatov's visit to Samara ended with a tour of a number of conversion enterprises. At the Samara state scientific-production enterprise Trud he was prototypes of the latest aircraft engines, which are unparalleled anywhere in the world. Khasbulatov's plant guide was chief designer and Academician Nikolay Kuznetsov. Khasbulatov also held closed-door meetings with the directors of enterprises in the aerospace complex. Khasbulatov's agenda for tomorrow includes a tour of oblast villages.

Begins Visit in Saratov

LD2905174793 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 29 May 93

[Video report by correspondent I. Deryugin; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] On the first day of his visit to Saratov region, [Khasbulatov] the parliament speaker familiarized himself with the work of defense enterprises, which account for a considerable share of the region's industry. Having spent some time in the Engels special car factory, where he familiarized himself with its conversion output—passenger buses—and promised to examine the factory management's request for subsidies, Ruslan Khasbulatov moved on to the "Banner of Labor" works. The works, which earlier was involved in strictly military production, is having difficulties with present-day conversion.

At a meeting with the works' collective, the Supreme Soviet chairman complained about international financial bodies which, in his view, have already divided the former Soviet Union into spheres of influence, and praised himself as a person who, unlike other deputies, displays uncommon determination in the present-day political crisis. Tomorrow the parliamentary speaker is to meet with the oblast's leadership.

Criticized by Saratov Workers

LD3005074593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0649 GMT 30 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Yakovlev]

[Text] Saratov, 30 May—Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, supports a complex regional conversion program developed by Saratov specialists. Khasbulatov is on a tour of Russian towns. On 29 May, he visited the "Banner of Labor" [znamia truda] factory, one of the oblast's defense enterprises. During a conversation that took place, workers levelled criticism at the Supreme Soviet for blunders and sloppy work by deputies, for laxity in the fight against crime, and for inconsistency in taking decisions. Ruslan Khasbulatov answered by saying that "maybe the speaker and the deputies of this convocation are no good, but while the Supreme Soviet exists and is in operation, democracy in Russia is in good hands."

Today, Ruslan Khasbulatov is meeting people's deputies, leaders of the oblast's executive authority, and enterprise directors. He is expected to travel to the village of Stepnoye, one of the rayons on the other side of the Volga [as received], where representatives of political and social movements, rayon leaders, and inhabitants of the former German autonomous region on the Volga are to gather.

Meets Protestors, Deputies

LD3005164493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1445 GMT 30 May 93

[Video report by correspondent Oleg Shommer; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Video shows "Saratov" caption; protestors carrying banners, including "A strong president means a strong Russia!" and "Khasbulatov! Your voters are in Chechnya, not Saratov!"; Khasbulatov walking past protestors into a building, then addressing a meeting inside]

Whereas yesterday the only people lining the path of the speaker of parliament were military academy students making the place look nice, today there were protestors waiting for him outside the oblast administration building. "Let the people decide, not the Congress"; "the soviets won't put food in your belly"; "Russia reborn needs a new constitution"—these are just a few of the slogans brandished by representatives of the committee to support the president and the Democratic Russia movement and other supporters of reform.

Regarding the new constitution, Ruslan Imranovich [Khasbulatov] said at a meeting with oblast soviet deputies that the issue of its adoption had been invented so as to distract attention from economic problems. He said that it was possible to pursue economic reform under the current constitution, for all its shortcomings. However, since the executive had inflicted on the people the question of adopting the basic law, Khasbulatov thought that three draft constitutions should be submitted to a referendum: the president's, the parliament's, and one for that section of the population that is receptive to communist ideas and actively absorbing them.

In the afternoon, the speaker of parliament visited one of the city's hospitals. After wishing the doctors and patients good health, he declared that the legislature, if supported by the people, would be capable of treating society's ills effectively.

But will it be possible to defeat the virus of political confrontation and get out of the power crisis? After all, as the ancients said, one of the conditions for recovery is the desire to recover.

Criticizes Government Industrial Policy

LD3005180093 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 30 May 93

[Video report by correspondent I. Deryugin; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] To get into the oblast's main administrative building, where he was to meet the Saratov leadership, the parliamentary speaker had to go through a corridor of pickets. Their slogans were eloquent, and so was the speaker himself—as always. His tour of towns in the Volga region, and visits to Defense Ministry enterprises further convinced Ruslan Khasbulatov that the government was purposefully pursuing a policy aimed at destroying progressive technologies in the country's industrial complex.

In this connection, disintegration processes were actively developing, affecting both the economic and political sphere. In the parliamentary speaker's words, attempts to impose a new constitution would complete the collapse of the state.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet also spoke of two of his own legislative initiatives currently studied by the Supreme Soviet. One is to reduce by half all federal taxes on goods-producers, the other, to introduce measures to regulate free circulation of hard currency within the country. [Video shows pickets with slogans reading "shame to Khasbulatov, demagogue and pharisee"; Yeltsin=Russia's revival" and others; Khasbulatov passing through; addressing a meeting from the rostrum]

Volga German Issue Viewed

LD3005222893 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 30 May 93

[Video report by Deryugin; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] During his second day in Saratov oblast, Ruslan Khasbulatov, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, visited a rayon with the nostalgic name of Sovetskiy. Villagers offered the speaker bread and salt, but also pickets, staged by opponents of German autonomy at the Volga river.

Answering the heated remarks of activists of the anti-German movement, who demanded that the issue of German autonomy in the Volga be taken off the agenda, Ruslan Khasbulatov said that the Supreme Soviet was not going to debate this issue at all.

In his opinion, there may be no question now of creating any kind of German state formation in the Volga area, for this is not the right political moment: Russia is already at grips with growing sovereignization, Balkanization, and disintegration.

The other problem, which for some reason excited most of the villagers, was the mass media. The speaker advised bodies of the representative power to put them under their control, upon which he left for Moscow.

N. Ossetia Seeks To Extend State of Emergency

LD2805162093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1558 GMT 28 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev and Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz May 28 TASS—A session of the North Ossetian Parliament decided by the majority of votes today to ask the Russian president to prolong the state of emergency regime from 2 p.m. on May 31 through 2 p.m. on July 31 in specific populated localities of the Prigorodnyy and Pravoberezhnyy regions and a number of settlements adjoining Vladikavkaz, and introduce the state of emergency regime on territory of the Mozdok region from May 31 through July 31.

The decision was taken after heated parliament debates in connection with the expiration on May 31 of the validity of Russian president's decree of March 27 to introduce state of emergency on territory of specific populated localities in the Ossetian-Ingush armed conflict zone to stabilize the situation.

The regional situation remains complicated. The parliament took into account requests of small councils of Vladikavkaz and Prigorodnyy and Pravoberezhnyy regions, as well as the Mozdok Regional Council's Presidium to prolong the state of emergency.

A North Ossetian Parliament resolution provides for a set of measures to ensure the safety of civilians, stressed Parliament Speaker Akhsarbek Galazov. It would be expedient to concentrate major peace-making forces on border line with Ingushetia, he said. All actions of the temporary administration should be coordinated with local Councils of People's Deputies of all levels.

Heads of the united investigaton team from the Russian Procurator General's Office, the Russian Interior and Security Ministries have been offered to carry out all investigation-operative arrangements together with the North Ossetian law enforcement bodies.

Officials Visit N. Ossetia, View Refugee Problems

LD2905145893 Mosocw ITAR-TASS in English 1238 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev, Mikhail Shvetsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz May 29 TASS—A group of Russian law-makers, led by Aziri Akhmetov, member of the Russian Parliamentary Commission for Affairs of Repressed and Deported People, met with Chairman of the Ossetian Parliament Akhsarbek Galazov and his First Deputy Chairman Yuriy Biragov in the North Ossetian Parliament on Saturday [29 May]. The meeting was devoted to the problem of the return of refugees and forcibly resettled people to their native places.

On the eve of the meeting, the Russian parliamentarians visited the Ingush Republic. On Saturday, they familiarized themselves with the situation in the Prigorodnyy region—the centre of the armed conflict.

Galazov and Biraghov stressed that the problems of the refugee return should be resolved in a comprehensive way, taking into account the multinational population of North Ossetia. In their opinion, Ingush refugees should be settled only in places, previously negotiated and predominantly populated by the Ingush people.

At present, in North Ossetia there are about 40,000 refugees from South Ossetia, Georgia, Central Asia, Ingushetia and the Chechen Republic. North Ossetia, with its limited financial possibilities, have been sheltering refugees for three years. However, it is quite apparent that North Ossetia is unable to resolve this problem alone. In the opinion of the North Ossetian leadership, under present conditions the return of these refugees is an absolutely unrealistic task.

Commenting on the socio-political situation in the region, Galazov said that it remains extremely complex. He said that tension would remain until an objective and legal assessment was given to the bloody tragedy which took place in the Prigorodnyy region and unless the solution of a complex problem of establishing peaceful relations between the two neighbouring republics is approached, taking into account the existing realities.

As for the forthcoming constitutional conference, Galazov noted that the presidential draft should serve as a basis for working out the single draft of a new constitution.

State of Emergency Declared in Ossetian, Ingush Regions

LD3005154593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1505 GMT 30 May 93

[Text] Moscow, 30 May (ITAR-TASS)—By decree of the president of the Russian Federation, a state of emergency is being imposed from 1400 on 31 May to 1400 on 31 July this year on the territory of Mozdokskiy rayon and Prigorodnyy rayon and localities adjoining the latter in the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and in Malgobekskiy and Nazranovskiy rayons of the Ingush Republic, in accordance with the RSFSR Law on the State of Emergency.

The existing state of emergency on part of the territory of Prigorodnyy rayon and localities adjoining it in the North Ossetian SSR and in part of Nazranovskiy rayon in the Ingush Republic is annulled from the same time.

The president's decree notes that the state of emergency is being imposed in connection with the worsening of the situation and with the increased incidence of terrorist acts and mass disturbances on nationalist grounds, involving firarms, caused to a large extent by failure of the sides to observe agreements reached on disarmament, on the search for missing persons, on the return of hostages, and on a comprehensive solution to the problem of refugees, and by the absence of peacemaking initiatives from either side.

A provisional administration is being introduced in the above areas as a special form of government for the period that the state of emergency is in force.

State of Emergency Detailed

LD3005162393 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1530 GMT 30 May 93

[Excerpts] Less than 30 minutes ago I read the ITAR-TASS report, and now further details have been faxed to us from the office of the president. This is the decree of the Russian Federation president on imposing a state of emergency on the territory of Mozdokskiy rayon and Prigorodnyy rayon and localities adjoining the latter in the North Ossetian Soviet Socialist Republic and in Malgobekskiy and Nazranovskiy rayons of the Ingush Republic. [passage omitted]

A provisional administration is being introduced in the above areas as a special form of government for the period that the state of emergency is in force. Its decrees and resolutions are binding for all state and public institutes, organizations, enterprises, establishments, and citizens. Rallies, street processions, and demonstrations as well as strikes are banned. Cold steel and fire arms, ammunition, toxic substances, and explosives, as well as military hardware will be confiscated from citizens, organizations, and enterprises.

The provisional administration has been instructed to impose a special regime for entering or leaving the area, as well as a special regime of travel inside the emergency zone, which includes searching vehicles and—in exceptional circumstances—searches of persons and homes.

A special regime for radio and television broadcasting and of the issue of publications has also been imposed.

The activities of public organizations and mass movements, which obstruct the normalization of the situation will be suspended after prior warning.

In order to ensure the state of emergency, the Russian Federation Ministry of the Interior has been instructed to increase the group of troops of the interior to 5,000 men. The Defense Ministry is to keep its group of troops, which was formed earlier, to ensure the state of emergency. [passage omitted]

Yerin Named Presidential Representative

LD3005170093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1624 GMT 30 May 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS]

[Text] Moscow May 30 TASS—By a decree of President Boris Yeltsin, Russian Minister of the Interior Viktor Yerin has been appointed official representative of the Russian president during the discussion in parliament of a draft resolution on the presidential decree introducing the state of emergency in territories of the Mozdok district, Prigorodnyy district and adjacent areas of the North Ossetian republic and of the Malgobek and Nazranovskiy districts of the Ingush Republic.

Situation 'Relatively Calm'

LD3105111793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1056 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev and Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz May 31 TASS—The situation in the narrow zone on the territory of North Ossetia and Ingushetia, where the state of emergency is to continue from May 31 to July 31 in accordance with the Russian president's decree, remains relatively calm. Russia's peacekeeping forces are fully in control of the situation, although criminal activity is still very high.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs of North Ossetia and Ingushetia has registered 17 crimes in the armed conflict zone in the past 24 hours, 22 people were detained for administrative offences and more than 2,000 cars were inspected. Five firearms and hundreds of rounds of ammunition have been seized from local inhabitants.

N. Ossetia, Ingush Officials Meet

LD3105204693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2031 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev and Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz June 1 TASS—A joint meeting of the Security Council of North Ossetia and the Military Council of the temporary administration on the territory of the North Ossetian and Ingush Republics ended here on Monday night. The two sides discussed a package of important issues connected with the mechanism for the implementation of the Russian president's decree on imposing a state of emergency on the territories of the Mozdok and Prigorodny districts, and the adjoining localities of the North Ossetian Republic, and the Nazran and Malgobek districts of the Ingush Republic.

Participants of the meeting paid special attention to ensuring security of civilian dwellers in the zone of state of emergency, coordinating joint actions by the temporary administration and military troops of the Russian Army attached to it, local authorities on improving the crime situation, strengthening the struggle against crime, searching for hostages and persons from both sides reported missing, and a comprehensive settlement of the problem of refugees.

Taking part in the meeting were chairman of the Supreme Soviet of North Ossetia Akhsarbek Galazov and head of the temporary administration, Colonel-General Yuriy Shatalin.

It is planned to hold a meeting of the Military Council of the temporary administration with the leadership of the Ingush Republic in the town of Nazran on June 1.

Situation in Emergency Zone 'Peaceful'

LD0106155193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1436 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Valeriy Shanayev and Mikhail Shevtsov]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, June 1 (TASS)—The first 24 hours in the limited zone on the territory of Northern Ossetia and Ingushetia where a state of emergency has been introduced in a decree by the Russian president for the period of May 31 to July 31 were relatively peaceful.

This is the conclusion of today's report from the headquarters of the temporary administration. No exchanges of fire, attacks on police checkpoints or conflict situations on inter-ethnic soil were registered.

According to local observers, the Russian presidential decree to introduce a state of emergency on the territory of the Mozdok and Prigorodny districts, as well as the neighbouring localities of Northern Ossetia and Nazran and Malgobek districts of the Republic of Ingushetia, is supported in Northern Ossetia.

Public opinion believes that at the present time the Russian troops are the only guarantor of stability in the region. The reaction to the decree from the Ingush side is as yet unknown.

However, it is intended to hold a joint session of the military council of the temporary administration with the leaders of the Ingush Republic in Nazran today. The meeting will study questions on implementing the Russian president's decree.

Meanwhile on Tuesday [1 June], staff of a joint commission continued going through a list of citizens of Ingush nationality who have expressed the wish to return to villages of the Prigorodny district of Northern Ossetia. 15,375 such applications have been made so far.

At the same time, the service of the negotiating process is preparing a package of documents on implementing the agreements reached in Kislovodsk on ways to solve the refugee situation.

ROSSISKAYA GAZETA Version of Khasbulatov Appeal

PM2805141193 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 May 93 First Edition p 1

[Undated "Appeal by R.I. Khasbulatov, Chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, to the Chechen People"]

[Text] Dear compatriots in the Chechen Republic!

On 5 June you are to express your attitude to everything that is taking place in the republic and to choose, in fact, the direction in which the republic will develop: Either to continue with the pointless orgy of the present ruling politicians which is shaming the republic with its reliance on criminal elements, national isolation, and unprofessionalism in all spheres of government, or to channel the difficult process of self-determination into positive actions where it will be possible at last to really get down to reforms, to restoring the abused dignity of citizens, and to strengthening friendly, human relations with each other and with our good neighbors. With those with whom our people have for centuries lived in peace and accord. Therefore I want to call on you, my dear fellow countrymen, not to remain on the sidelines on 5 June but to go to vote at the polling places. For this is not a time when you can show placidity and trustfulness or remain indifferent to your people's fate.

The regime which has been in power for almost two years in the republic and which has so many times stated its adherence to democracy and sovereignty in fact is bankrupt. It has used the noble idea of democracy to sow a spirit of aggression and national enmity which is not characteristic of the people, and the sacred concepts of liberty and sovereignty have been employed merely to clear the way for unhindered plunder and theft of national wealth in the interests of a narrow and criminal group of people close to power.

It is indicative that over these two years the present rulers have not taken any steps to really reform the economy. On the contrary there has been bureaucratic centralization, which allows only the present rulers who have latched onto the state trough and the levers of power to become rich. In essence the great wealth of potential which many generations and the peoples of the Chechen-Ingush Republic created has been squandered.

Let us take the following fact. In the past, only 2 percent of the revenue from the sale of oil remained at the republic's disposal. Now all 100 percent remain. And what has happened? Have you become richer because of that? Unfortunately many have already personally experienced what starvation, poverty, and despair mean. This is terrible but true. Unemployment totals 30 percent of the able-bodied population—even the poorest states in Africa do not have figures like this. There has been an unprecedented—60 percent—slump in industrial production, many enterprises have stopped, equipment has been and is being pilfered, and technological transport and materials are being sold off. In the less than two years of the Dudayev regime's rule the damage to the national economy has exceeded 70 billion rubles. Millions of tonnes of oil products have disappeared without trace.

Is it thinkable that last year and this year not a single school, hospital, or club has been commissioned in the republic? There has been no time to do this because as a result of inept management of the economy the republic is an extremely unfavorable zone for new investments. Billions of petrorubles and dollars are ending up abroad and in commercial structures in all countries of the former USSR and are not returning to the republic.

You know this better than I do since you experience every day the "joys" of Dudayev's rule, which has resulted literally in degradation of the people's moral and ethical values. Killings and robberies have become an everyday occurrence. Fear has gripped the republic. The saddest thing is that people who have lived in Chechnya for many years—Russians, Ingush, Dagestanis, Armenians—are leaving.

Over the last two years the republic has been turned into a criminal cesspool and a staging post for international drug trafficking. The regime is now defended by so-called national guardsmen—former prisoners in the Naurskaya prison. On the other hand, the former law-enforcement system has been utterly destroyed. As a result, out of the 10,000 crimes committed last year, only one in 10 came to court. It is painful to admit it, but today Chechnya is used as a bogeyman for the Russian and world public, and for international public opinion the republic has become a symbol of senseless threats to blow up nuclear power stations and to carry out terrorist acts in Russian cities. This gives rise to alarm, hostility, and frank surprise.

The republic still has a chance of peaceful rebirth. That chance must be seized. But to do that, on 5 June we must take into our hands not weapons but voting papers. The world knows innumerable examples of how this peaceful act of expression of the people's will has made it possible to inject tranquillity and harmony into accumulated passions.

The present confrontation cannot produce anything useful or positive. New people who will be obliged to put the country back on its feet must come to the leadership of the republic. Without Russia and without close links with Russia it is impossible to do this. We have lived in friendship for centuries. The ruling nationalist regime has been unable to break the firm economic, cultural, scientific, and above all human ties between us. The new leadership must also sign the Federation Treaty. The republic must have friendly peoples and republics around it. And your choice on 5 June will help to bring that about. Parliamentarianism in the republic must become a form of people's power which will place a firm barrier in the path of the dictatorial ambitions of the new "leaders of the nation."

I appeal personally to President Dudayev to resign voluntarily in order to ensure that people's suffering ceases, brother does not attack brother and son attack father in Chechnya, and the terrible shadow of the past—blood feud—does not cover our beloved land.

I am sure that the people will make the right choice on 5 June.

Chechen Court Terms Dudayev's Acts 'Criminal'

LD2805201193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 28 May 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A report from Groznyy: Chechnya's Constitutional Court regards as criminal such actions by President Dudayev as stripping Parliament of its powers, creating an illegal government, as well as numerous breaches of the Constitution.

Dudayev accused Ruslan Khasbulatov, speaker of the Russian Federation parliament of organizing political actions against him. An aid to Dudayev stated in an interview to Ekho Moskvy radio station that Ruslan Khasbulatov has thrown away his mask and revealed who is the real leader of the events taking place in Groznyy.

Chechen Court Demands Resignation of Officials

LD2905101493 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 29 May 93

[Text] The chairman of the legal committee under Chechen leader Dzhokhar Dudayev has confirmed for our correspondent the existence of a decision of the republic's Constitutional Court, dated 18 May. The document refers to violations of the Constitution of Chechnya committed by a number of the republic's officials. They include the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, his deputy, the procurator general and Dudayev himself.

However, as the chairman of the legal committee noted, the actions of these persons are not described in the decision as criminal. Nevertheless, the Constitutional Court of Chechnya demanded the resignation of the abovementioned persons.

As for the resignation of General Dudayev, the question must be decided in a referendum.

Chernomyrdin on Vacation in Sochi; Comments on Ruble

LD2905122893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1200 GMT 29 May 93

[Text] Viktor Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers, who is on holiday in Sochi, told a RIA correspondent today that the Russian Government has already drawn up a program for stabilizing the ruble. The program is, naturally, linked with a program for increasing the production of goods in the country. After it has been fulfilled, there will be no other currency in circulation in Russia but the ruble.

Today Viktor Chernomyrdin visited the construction site of a new four-star hotel to be called Lazurnaya.

Tours Krasnodar Kray

LD3105193393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1410 GMT 31 May 93

[Summary] Moscow, 31 May (ITAR-TASS)—Viktor Chernomyrdin, the chairman of the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers—who is on vacation in Sochi—is continuing to familiarize himself with the problems of Krasnodar Kray. The Russian Government's press service reported that he visited Sochi's largest commercial production enterprise today—a private firm making clothing, shoes, and hats.

Viktor Chernomyrdin spent some time with border guards serving on board an escort vessel in the Black Sea. He had conversations with the commander and crew of the vessel.

On 1 June Viktor Chernomyrdin plans to fly over Krasnodar Kray's coastal regions, become acquainted with the work of the port of Novorossiysk, and hold a meeting with transport workers and officials.

Meets Local Leaders

LD2905165893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1537 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Irina Shcehgoleva]

[Text] Sochi May 29 TASS—Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin today met with the leadership of the resort city of Sochi to discuss the resort's problems and the fulfillment of the government's decision on state support for the functioning and development of this Black Sea coast resort.

Later, Chernomyrdin told journalists that there were two groups of problems which he promised local authorities to help solve—the short term problems, including financing and easy credits for food purchases, and longer-term problems, including the working out of a long-term programme for the development of the resort.

"It is important to develop a theoretically based programme with a vision of a future to avoid numerous mistakes," the prime minister stressed.

Responding to questions from journalists about his impressions from a recent tour of the north caucasus, Chernomyrdin pointed out that the situation in the region was far from simple, but there was no sense in dramatizing it still further. On the whole, it is tending towards normalisation but requires serious attention all the same, he said.

Chernomyrdin in Novorossiysk To Discuss Port Project

LD0106082293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0741 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Viktor Zhilyakov]

[Text] Novorossiysk, 1 Jun—Novorossiysk is destined to become Russia's largest modern port on the Black Sea, Viktor Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent today after arriving here on a short working visit.

In this connection the head of the Russian government stressed that Russia "has in effect been left without ports on the Black Sea," so that the task of developing port complexes on the Black Sea as soon as possible is topical right now. In the prime minister's words, Novorossiysk is most suited to become Russia's largest port complex on the Black Sea.

Viktor Chernomyrdin said that the principal topics for discussion at the conference he is to hold in the city today will include "the state of port buildings on the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, as well as projects for the future."

In accordance with existing projects, a second unit of the seaport is expected to be constructed in Novorossiysk's Tsemes Bay, as well as another railroad line; the city of Novorossiysk itself is to be expanded.

After the conference, which is due to be held this afternoon, Viktor Chernomyrdin is expected to leave for Sochi to resume his vacation.

Ukrainian Ports To Be Replaced

LD0106121493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1040 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Viktor Zhilyakov]

[Text] Novorossijsk, June 1 (TASS)—Russia plans to end its dependence on Ukrainian ports in foreign trade and will boost its own facilities on the coast of the Black and Azov Seas, according to a closed-door conference on transportation held in Novorossijsk on Tuesday and chaired by the Russian prime minister.

Novorossijsk and Tuapse are to become the major Black Sea ports of Russia which remained practically without any facilities after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Most major ports remained on the Ukrainian territory.

Head of the administration of the southern Krasnodar region Nikolay Yegorov told TASS after the conference that Novorossijsk and Tuapse are to double their cargo processing capacities which "will allow to transfer some 30 million tonnes of cargoes from Ukrainian ports". Another major port will be built in Novorossijsk, he stressed.

"The remaining cargo turnout of 12-14 million tonnes will be switched over to the ports on the Azov Sea", he said, adding that thus all "southern cargo flows" will be processed in Russian ports.

In future the ports have to increase their capacity and annually process additional 50 million tonnes of cargoes, according to Yegorov.

"The Black Sea coast is to be viewed as a region of special importance not only for Krasnodar territory, but for the whole of Russia", Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin told the two-hour long conference.

Democratic Reforms Movement Conference Opens in Tver

LD2905104093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0811 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tver May 29 TASS—The first national conference of the Russian Movement for Democratic Reforms (RMDR) opens in Tver on Saturday [29 May].

The conference will discuss problems of the RMDR, the constitutional process in Russia and work out the strategy and tactics for the forthcoming elections.

Professor Gavriil Popov, chairman of the RMDR board, is expected to make a report at the conference.

The conference will be attended by regional leaders, prominent politicians and entrepreneurs.

Supports Constitutional Conference

LD2905220393 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 29 May 93

[Text] The Democratic Reform Movement [DRM] has ended a national conference in Tver—a Russian city north of Moscow—by supporting Boris Yeltsin's decision to call a constitutional conference in the Russian capital on 5th June. The DRM statement says the movement is ready to take part in the forum, involving representatives of federal and regional governments, parties, movements and clergy and the country's business community. The conference is designed to finalize Russia's new constitution and discuss the question of how to adopt it.

Further on Conference

MK0106084693 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jun 93 p 1

[Indira Dunayeva report: "Russian Democratic Reform Movement Is Yet To Decide on Election Bloc Partners. Movement Holds First National Conference"]

[Text] The first national conference of the Russian Democratic Reform Movement [RDRM] was held on 29 May in Tver, at which Gavriil Popov spelled out his "10 Theses for the Constitutional Conference." On the basis of his theses, those participating in the conference (around 150 people from 55 regions of Russia) decided that the RDRM supports the idea of the Constitutional Conference's discussing only a transition-period constitutional law on the relationship between the federal branches of power. This law should be based on four sections of the presidential draft constitution: on the Russian Federation president, on the Federal Assembly, on the government, and on justice in Russia. According to Popov, it is these sections that are necessary for adopting the law on elections, and they could also make up the Constitutional Law for the transition period. The conference requested that Gavriil Popov defend the RDRM stance at the Constitutional Conference.

The conference also adopted the resolution "On the participation by the RDRM in the 'Election-93' electoral bloc." It set out the main current objective of the RDRM—to work out a liberal- democratic electoral platform. Members of the movement are considering three possible options of participation in the electoral blocs: first, with Democratic Choice [Demokraticheskiy Vybor]—mentioned in the resolution as a bloc of administration loyalists; second, with liberal-democratic movements and parties that distance themselves from the administration, but support the reform course; and third, a bloc with the centrists.

The definitive choice will depend on the future balance of political platforms in the above listed organizations and in the RDRM, and also on what mechanism of holding parliamentary elections is chosen (district-based, party list-based, or mixed).

After the law on elections is passed and their date is announced, the RDRM will again convene a conference to decide which of the three proposed paths of participating in the parliamentary elections would be an optimum one.

Regional Leaders Comment on Constitution

PM2805144593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 27 May 93 p 1

[Roundup of comments on constitutional issue by leaders of Orenburg, Altay, and Krasnodar regions: "Democracy or the Soviets: Who Will Win?"]

[Text] Just a few days remain before the opening of the Constitutional Conference. Regardless of its status, this organ is obviously going to have an extraordinary role to play. Is the country going to start its history anew or will the senseless political troubles go on—that is the question that Russians expect it to answer. Our correspondents in Novosibirsk, Krasnodar, and Khabarovsk asked some of the participants in the Constitutional Conference to answer three questions from the editorial office.

1. What is your personal view of the two draft Constitutions?

2. How do you see the role of the Constitutional Conference?

3. In your view, which representative organ should adopt the final version of the Basic Law?

Vladimir Yelagin, head of the Orenburg Oblast Administration:

1. As the conference of heads of administrations of the Urals region showed, we tend more toward the president's version. It is more concise and legally correct. That is confirmed by our legal experts.

Although I have to say that both drafts suffer from serious defects. In both, the question of the unequal rights of the Federation's territories remains unresolved. Essentially, they are divided into four categories. The republics and their citizens have the greatest rights, the oblasts and their citizens have least. In addition, such questions as the ownership of land and the political independence of a territory cannot be resolved overnight or at a stroke.

2. I believe that the parallel constitutional processes here should merge into one. That explains our tactic, which is that when the draft new Constitution is approved the citizens of the country should be the winner, not this or that branch of power.

3. I do not believe that a new Constitution can be adopted by all the people in a referendum. This is too delicate a mechanism. At the same time there is a danger that the tide of political passions at the Congress could turn the Constitution into a patchwork. Whichever way it is adopted, in my view, it should be an interim Constitution. One way or another, our participants in the conference, no matter which commission they are working on, intend to pursue a single line and defend the region's interests.

Aleksandr Surikov, chairman of the Altay Kray Soviet:

1. Both draft Constitutions need major reworking.

2. It seems to me that the Constitutional Commission has been legislatively expanded to [zakonodatelno rasshirena do] the Constitutional Conference.

3. The Constitutional Conference will submit the draft Constitution, reworked in the light of proposals from the components of the Federation, to nationwide discussion and then to signature by the components of the Federation. At least two-thirds of those components have to sign it. After that the Congress of People's Deputies, placed within definite parameters, will adopt this Constitution. If the Basic Law is not adopted at the Congress another organ will be created for that purpose.

Yuriy Zenyuk, chief editor of the newspaper YUG and deputy chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia's Krasnodar Kray Organization:

1. Both drafts of the Basic Law have their good points and their bad points. The president's version guarantees a firm, strong, and truly democratic power. The draft makes it possible to resolve two tasks at the same time—preserving the unity of the country and creating a rule-of-law state.

But the president's draft violates a most important democratic principle: One man, one vote. But under this system 14 percent of the population will have as many votes as the remaining 86 percent of Russia's inhabitants. The draft proposed by deputies has managed to avoid that. That is its only advantage.

2. As for the role of the Constitutional Conference, I would like to note that in my view it would be expedient to create a Constitutional Assembly which should improve the text of the president's draft, refine it, and clarify the questions of the formation of the power structures. For example, it is better to transform the Federation Council into a lower chamber while the State Duma should be the upper chamber.

3. A Constitutional Assembly should also determine the means of adopting the new Russian Constitution. I am convinced that both the Supreme Soviet and especially the Congress of People's Deputies not only cannot but do not have the moral right to adopt the Constitution. After all, the results of the April referendum showed that only one in five of the country's inhabitants trust the deputies. Consequently, the task of a Constitutional Assembly is to bring the draft Fundamental Law to a state which enables it to be submitted to nationwide approval—under no circumstances should two drafts be submitted to a referendum—and makes it possible to avoid splitting the country into opposing camps. In an extreme case the country's Fundamental Law could be adopted by a Constituent Assembly.

International Affairs

Government Sets Conditions on Nuclear Disarmament

MK2905113093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 29 May 93 p 1

[Vladimir Skachko report under "Nuclear Weapons" rubric: "Will Ukraine Become a Nonnuclear State? Ratification of START I Postponed Again"]

[Text] Addressing a meeting with journalists at the Ukrainian national press club, Boris Tarasyuk, chairman of the national committee on disarmament and deputy foreign minister of Ukraine, stated that the deputies were to have considered the START I Treaty, the Lisbon protocol, and the treaty on nuclear nonproliferation on 20 and 21 May 1993, but that this was prevented by the events surrounding the government. According to Boris Tarasyuk, the said documents are ready and will necessarily be considered in parliament in June. This statement, however, appears problematical, first, given the mood of the deputies who are demanding a nuclear status for Ukraine, and second, in view of the fact that so far the draft military doctrine has not been adopted. Moreover, Tarasyuk himself pointed out that the documents are ready for examination but that the matter now rests with the deputies. According to Tarasyuk, the deputies are setting four main conditions for the ratification of these documents: provision of security guarantees, compensation for tactical and strategic nuclear weapons, assistance in financing the disarmament process and ensuring the inspection and monitoring of the missiles located in Ukraine without delay, and also oversight of the dismantling and destruction of nuclear weapons. Boris Tarasyuk specially stressed that Ukraine did not transfer to Russia tactical nuclear weapons last spring but took them away for dismantling and destruction. According to Boris Tarasyuk, the cost of the nuclear disarmament process is $2.8 billion. As is known, Ukrainian Defense Minister Konstantin Morozov cited a different figure—$3 billion. Furthermore, Boris Tarasyuk confirmed that during the visit to Ukraine by U.S. diplomat Strobe Talbott, the United States demonstrated full understanding of Ukraine's position with regard to its demand of compensation for theater nuclear weapons.

Continuing, Boris Tarasyuk proceeded to brief those present on the fundamental provisions of the basic directions of Ukraine's foreign political activity and the Ukrainian initiative on creating a European collective security system that was advanced by Leonid Kravchuk last February in Switzerland. According to Tarasyuk, Ukraine proceeds from the premise that after the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact, a security vacuum has emerged in central and eastern Europe which is made worse by the fact that NATO is in no particular hurry to admit the new states into its ranks. The newly independent states, in the deputy minister's opinion, have common problems. These include their own security owing to growing mutual contradictions, the rights of ethnic minorities, and problems arising from the disintegration of the socialist economic space. Therefore Ukraine has come out with the proposal to create a central-east European stability and security area (CEESSA) which would not be a cordon sanitaire around Russia but would serve as a link between Russia and Western Europe in building a broad transatlantic security system from Vancouver to Vladivostok, in other words in the so-called CSCE region. The motto of this plan is: security for one via security for all.

Boris Tarasyuk said that Ukraine's initiative has been received with interest in Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Moldova. In the opinion of Ukraine, the CEESSA could include the states in the European part of the former USSR and countries of eastern and central Europe. This space, according to Tarasyuk, would be not a union of states, nor a new military-political bloc, but a mechanism for broad bilateral and multilateral consultations both for settling disputes and for preventing new conflicts. Ukraine itself, according to Tarasyuk, cannot participate in any bloc since it has proclaimed its neutrality. Tarasyuk said that Ukraine sees four main conditions for its own security: first, mobile and combat-worthy national armed forces; second, bilateral relations guaranteeing security; third, the creation of a European collective security system; and fourth, the provision of security guarantees by the nuclear powers. The deputy minister reported that Ukraine has already received texts of the Declaration "On Guaranteeing Ukraine's Security" from Great Britain, France, Russia, and the United States. China has also agreed to provide such a declaration. In Boris Tarasyuk's opinion, Ukraine would prefer not declarations but rather a multilateral treaty-type legally binding document, but the nuclear powers would not agree.

The position of the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs is this: If parliament makes a decision to seek the signing of such a legally binding document, the Foreign Ministry will implement that line. In addition, Boris Tarasyuk said that Ukraine is so far not content with either the texts of the declaration "on security guarantees" or with the fact that the nuclear powers are ready to promulgate them only after the Ukrainian parliament has ratified the nuclear disarmament documents. Ukraine wants these declarations to be signed before these documents are considered in the Supreme Soviet. The declarations should guarantee nonaggression against Ukraine both with nuclear and conventional weapons, exclusion of economic and political pressure, and respect for territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders. Furthermore, Ukraine would very much like to get acquainted with the mechanism of realization of these guarantees.

Judging by Boris Tarasyuk's words, one could understand that failure to meet these conditions could prevent the deputies from passing a positive ruling on the nuclear disarmament documents.

Decision on Nuclear Weapons To Be Decided After START I

LD3005220193 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 30 May 93

[Text] As far as strategic nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory are concerned, this issue will be solved after the Supreme Council of our state considers the START I treaty. But already tne Ministry of Defense, together with other ministries, has worked out a program for their elimination and submitted it for the consideration of the Cabinet of Ministers. This has been declared by Colonel General Anatoliy Lopata, chief of the general staff of the armed forces of Ukraine and first deputy defense minister, during his meeting with the officers of a rocket division, which is part of the 43d rocket army. It is deployed on the territory of Ukraine.

In the opinion of Anatoliy Lopata, specialized and technical problems related to this issue can be solved.

Analyst Views Relations With United States

AU2805160193 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 27 May 93 p 3

[Article by columnist Volodymyr Skachko: "Fools Are Taken With Fine Promises, But These Promises Are Good, Because They Are American, or Why Nobody Feels Like Giving Thanks for the New Approaches"]

[Text] Undoubtedly, for many people at the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and for all those who, for various reasons, watched attentively the development of relations between Ukraine and the United States and the attitude of the overseas superpower to Ukraine, the first 10 days in May were passed waiting for Strobe Talbott's visit to Kiev. He is the ambassador for extraordinary missions, the U.S. secretary of state's adviser for ties with new independent states, a specialist in questions of eastern (or postsocialist) Europe, and a personal friend of Bill Clinton himself. It was this brainy and pragmatic high official, whom observers characterize as a "gray cardinal" of the White House in the eyes of the Ukrainian establishment, who was behind the article by R. Popadiuk, U.S. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in Ukraine: "You Don't Even Realize How Important You Are" published in HOLOS UKRAYINY (30 April).

It was, therefore, expected that Strobe Talbott would "bring" to Kiev a genuine change in the U.S. policy regarding its attitude to Ukraine, specific proposals, and, maybe, also a plan for assistance with specific sums of money stated. Some people in Kiev even rubbed their hands in anticipation: Well, they said, Kiev has demonstrated its firmness and intransigence regarding the ratification of treaties on nuclear disarmament, and now Washington itself has complied.

However, things did not exactly develope the way we would like them to have developed. It is true that Kiev was the first stopover on S. Talbott's trip to the CIS. He did state that "not only the White House, but also the entire administration has thoroughly revised our policy toward and our relations with Ukraine," that "in our relations with all the new independent states, we want to replace the word 'pressure' with another key word—'partnership.'" However, there was nothing much in particular that could be openly discussed. At the news conference held on 10 May, it became known that S. Talbott is considering tentative accords on the creation of Ukrainian-American groups for elaborating questions of military cooperation and conversion, U.S. offers to assist in implementing privatization and to act as an intermediary for the improvement of Ukrainian-Russian relations (the guest remarked that this can only be done if both sides agree), support for the idea of a possible June signing of a Ukrainian-American charter on the improvement of bilateral relations, and an invitation extended to Ukrainian Defense Minister K. Morozov to visit Washington as a result of the meetings and talks, including the closed meeting with L. Kravchuk. S. Talbott stressed that, now, "a clearer idea of the Ukrainian viewpoint will become known in America," as well as that "Ukraine will strive to become nuclear-free."

Our deputy minister of foreign affairs, B. Tarasyuk, having remarked that consultations at the level of experts will continue, stated that "there is every reason to hope that Ukrainian-American relations will improve radically in the near future."

That was all. Yes, there are grounds for disappointment. However, in my opinion, one should not feel disappointed. First, because nobody gives away money to others, especially in order to make those others really strong. Ukraine is no exception here. Second, a change in the attitude toward Ukraine has, after all, occurred. However, what kind of change? In Russia, there is an apt saying: "By hook or by crook." The tactic has changed (to be more precise, the renunciation of direct pressure), but the old strategy has remained: To see to it that Ukraine gets rid of nuclear weapons at any price. That is why, in my opinion, there are key words in the aforementioned article by R. Popadiuk and in the interview with S. Talbott (HOLOS UKRAYINY, 11 May) that people, for some reason, did not notice or preferred to mistrust. Just compare! R. Popadyuk: "...Ukraine must display responsibility and confirm its constructive position before the world community, a position that envisages adherence to accords." S. Talbott: "...while truly establishing partners' relations with any country, one must be convinced that his partner fulfills international obligations." This may also be understood in the following way: Disarm faster. Besides, both Americans reminded Ukrainian politicians that such a vision of Ukraine's future (which suits the West—V.S.) "remains outside the field of vision of many people" (R. Popadyuk) and that "I hope that both we and Ukrainian leaders will take full advantage of this (a new approach of the U.S. leadership—V.S) to the benefit of the two countries" (S. Talbott). Or, in my opinion, in a different way: If you comply, you will get something today, even though in the form of political support.

Since S. Talbott became convinced that Ukraine will become nuclear-free in the future, there is a hope that the "new approach" will work. Well, frankly speaking, this is not the main point. More specifically, it was not Ukraine's intransigence that was the main reason for Talbott's visit. The United States has simply changed its policy, proceeding from its own interests, both in this region and, perhaps, in the whole of Europe. Let us look into this, because components of the "new approach" are closely interwoven and are important for Ukraine.

Let us take the United States' consent to act as an intermediary for improving Ukrainian-Russian relations and see in Ukraine a counterbalance to Russia in the Eastern European region. In my opinion, first, as a result of this, the United States may try to force Russia to somehow compensate Ukraine for the tactical nuclear weapons that were transferred to Russia and, at the expense of somebody else's money, make Ukraine more complaisant in the question of nuclear disarmament.

Second, notwithstanding all declarations of the Russian-American friendship, the United States, fulfilling the instructions of H. Kissinger, Z. Brzezinski, and others who want to see an ultimate collapse of the "evil empire," is not, in fact, interested in the rise of a strong Russia or in the restoration of a bipolar world and of a confrontation between the two superpowers. American politicians cannot help seeing Russian involvement, as the Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA repeatedly wrote, in the Dniester conflict, in the Georgian-Abkhazian events, in the war between Azerbaijan and Armenia, and in the civil war in Tajikistan. Secretly or openly generating conflicts, Russia may then act as an intermediary in settling them and thereby intensify its influence by tying the appeased sides to itself and by enhancing the process through exerting economic pressure. The United States cannot help seeing this and, therefore, it needs a certain counterbalance to Russia, a kind of buffer, the role that it is ready to give to Ukraine. This would, in general, be ideal for Washington: The states are not very weak and not very strong and, moreover, they counterbalance each other. However, for Ukraine today it is a certain guarantee of its security. This is one aspect of the problem, so to speak, a geopolitical one.

However, there is yet another aspect and a much more deserving one. Now that the end of the confrontation in Yugoslavia has become visible, the United States and Western Europe cannot help seeing that the threat of a "Balkanization of Europe" may issue from a somewhat more distant eastern Europe. While gradually extinguishing the conflict in the immediate vicinity of Swiss banks, the peacemakers in the West must finally "recall" that the "burning Caucasus" is also in Europe and that blood has been spilled there much longer than in Yugoslavia (remember the conflict in Nagorno- Karabakh). I reiterate, the West needs an intermediary and, preferably, a European one, rather than Iran, Turkey, or, God forbid, Iraq. So why not Ukraine, which has already displayed its readiness to mediate in the Dniester Region, in Georgia, and in Armenia. Its boys are perishing while bringing peace to Yugoslavia.

In the U.S. actions, one can also discern a fear that events may take as incredible a course as the emergence of a union of Eastern and Western Europe and its transformation into a powerful geopolitical center. It is, therefore, not the same for Washington, under whose leadership the postsocialist camp (including Ukraine and Russia with their potentials) will integrate into the world community, and we will see whether the United States will maintain its interests in this region. It is already becoming somewhat hilarious: As soon as somebody goes to Moscow from Bonn, Kiev receives some promises from Washington. Somebody in America promises things to Moscow—this is followed by a trip from Kiev to Bonn. One's head is going round from these "maneuvers," yet there is no progress in either Yugoslavia or on the territory of the former USSR....

However, as they say, the search continues, and, for that reason, there emerged a "new approach" toward Ukraine, because, on its territory, in addition to everything else, there are also nuclear weapons, although it was declared that they had been retargeted, at "non-American targets," but who knows....

It only remains to find out what Ukraine is supposed to do in this situation and how it can use this knot of contradictions to its own advantage. Fortunately, this is not within journalists' competence and there is a hope that our country's policy and tasks are clearly defined in the "Principal Trends of the External Policy" that were amended by parliamentary standing commissions and discussed behind closed doors. I want to believe that this was not due to their ineptness. In conclusion, I would like to recall an old English rule—about the absence of permanent political friends or adversaries and the permanent nature of one's own interests. The main thing is to recognize them and, without conceding important principles, implement them as much as we can, using all possibilities, no matter how small they may be. Because today, we cannot expect that all of our problems may be resolved faster and at one go. Besides, one doesn't feel like thanking anybody for anything.

Foreign Ministry Protests Over Black Sea Fleet

LD2805192493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1757 GMT 28 May 93

[By UKRINFORM for TASS]

[Text] Kiev, 28 May—Hoisting the St. Andrew's flag on auxiliary and service craft of the Black Sea Fleet is a direct violation of the Yalta agreement. It undermines the groundwork for a possible understanding on the division of the Black Sea Fleet, makes impossible its logistic and technical support during the transitional period, and generally does not help to reach the final goal shared by the Russian Federation and Ukraine, i.e., forming the Russian Federation navy and the Ukrainian naval forces on the basis of the Black Sea Fleet. This is stated in a note of the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, delivered to Smolyakov, Russian Federation ambassador to Ukraine.

Such actions, the document says, "bring to naught all the difficult efforts made in the past with the aim of resolving the situation in and around the Black Sea Fleet, and could lead to unpredictable consequences contrary to the interests of both states." By way of fulfilling the Yalta Agreement on the Black Sea Fleet, says the note of the Ukrainian foreign ministry, the Ukrainian side has suggested that talks between state delegations of the two countries be held without delay to continue drafting agreements in concrete terms, and also that a meeting of the presidents of Ukraine and the Russian Federation be held as soon as possible to discuss the entire range of issues connected with dividing the Black Sea Fleet.

Morozov Refuses To Pay Crews Flying 'Alien Flag'

LD0106081593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0805 GMT 1 Jun 93

[By UKRINFORM-TASS]

[Text] Kiev June 1 TASS—Ukraine will not tolerate in its territorial waters warships under an alien flag and will not pay wages to the crews of those Black Sea ships which have hoisted the Russian maritime flag, according to Ukrainian Defence Minister Konstantin Morozov.

However, he told the "NARODNAYA ARMIA" (PEOPLE'S ARMY) newspaper on Tuesday that if the crews lower the St. Andrew's flag Ukraine will change its decision.

He accused "anti-Ukrainian" forces in the Crimea and in Russia for instigating the seamen to raise the St. Andrew's flag. "The attempt to play the Crimean card by foreign-based players is evident", the minister said.

Morozov added that Russian and Ukrainian state commissions should investigate the reasons for violations of the Yalta agreements on the disputed Black Sea Fleet.

But the commander of the Black Sea Fleet, Admiral Eduard Baltin, believes the Ukrainian Defence Ministry should be responsible for the recent aggravation of the conflict over the navy.

He officially protested to Ukrainian Prosecutor General Viktor Shishkin against "unilateral actions of the Ukrainian Defence Ministry towards units and formations" under his command, TASS learned from the press centre of the Black Sea Fleet.

Baltin accused the Ukrainian military of attempts "to prove by any means that the Yalta agreement is incapable and is to be denounced".

He expressed concern over the latest developments at the navy and said that the Ukrainian military command bears full responsibility for them.

Kravchuk Interview Urges Meeting With Yeltsin

LD3005194093 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1800 GMT 30 May 93

[Interview with President Leonid Kravchuk by announcer Yevgeniy Kiselev; Kravchuk in Kiev studio and Kiselev in Moscow studio; from the "Itogi" newscast—live]

[Text] [Kiselev] Now, on the line with us is the Kiev television studio, where Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk is. I greet you, Leonid Makarovich, and thank you for agreeing to take part in today's edition of "Itogi."

[Kravchuk] I greet you too.

[Kiselev] Two weeks ago, Ukrainian Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma explained in an interview for our program that his government requires powers to continue the reforms. Without waiting for voting on this issue, you proposed assuming responsibility yourself and heading the government yourself, which automatically meant the departure of Kuchma from the political scene. What was the cause of your announcement, which was so unexpected to many?

[Kravchuk] That is not quite correct, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich. I put forward three possible alternatives for the resolution of this issue. Either powers are granted to the government and corresponding amendments are entered in the constitution; or the president enters the executive estate, heads the cabinet of ministers, and corresponding amendments are also entered in the constitution; or the third option, whereby the parliament works on a permanent basis, adopts the laws and resolutions that are so vital at the moment for reforms and for the advancement of all the processes that have been noted, both in the economy, and in the political and other spheres. All three options, naturally, require amendments to the constitution.

It seemed to me that the most acceptable kind of option was the one in which the president takes on these powers.

[Kiselov] I realize that, evidently, this option is closer to your heart, as it were. But I recall that last year, when former Prime Minister Fokin resigned, and there were calls in the parliament at that time and in Ukraine's political circles for you to take on the leadership of the Cabinet of Ministers, you did not make the relevant decision then. What has changed since then? Why...

[Kravchuk, interrupting] Again, this is not quite correct. At that time, I expressed the view that this option was possible. A different option occurred. The government was given the opportunity to work under special conditions. I want to make one thing clear, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich, this option is not closer to my heart. If I did this under conditions in which the economy was on the upturn, the crisis was being overcome, and all the economic systems were working sufficiently robustly, then the president proposes an option that would basically give him the chance to exploit this upturn. But what

I am proposing is to take power under conditions of an extremely dire economic crisis.

[Kiselev] Tell me, Leonid Makarovich, what course will your reforms take? Will it be the course of stabilization, of privatization, of a tight monetary policy? For how long will they be carried out? With what team do you intend to carry them out?

[Kravchuk] At present, our situation is quite difficult. Virtually all the decrees adopted by the government have come into contradiction with the laws passed by the Supreme Soviet, and now we ought to clear up our legislation. This is the first priority.

Second, we ought to open the way toward privatization. Third, we inevitably ought to approach monetary reform—this is the third aspect of our tasks. The fourth aspect is further liberalization of foreign economic activities, creating necessary conditions for investment.

[Kiselev] But still, with what team will you carry out these transformations? Will it be Leonid Kuchma's team or some completely new cabinet?

[Kravchuk] Well, as I see it, it is going to be the team that is working now. Naturally, some changes are possible, but on the whole, the present team will form the basis. As I have said on quite a few occasions already, if we keep changing governments, each new one will be weaker than its predecessor—because we have not got much to fall back on, not so many substitutes available, as it were, as to change governments every month and to change the line-up of the government, that is, personalities. Therefore, I can see the government working at present as a basis.

[Kiselev] Leonid Makarovich, regarding the amendments that you plan to ask your republic's parliament to introduce into the Constitution, what sort of fate may await Leonid Kuchma himself?

[Kravchuk] When the three of us—Leonid Danylovych [Kuchma], Ivan Stepanovich Plyushch, chairman of the Supreme Council of Ukraine, and I—discussed this matter, we looked at various options. I proposed, for instance, that Ivan Stepanovich should head, should opt for, or should agree, so to speak, to become the vice president—if parliament elects him, of course. In this case, we propose that parliament should decide this matter. After a certain amount of thought, Ivan Stepanovich said that it could be Leonid Danylovych, too. I see the vice president as being one of these two. All the rest remains the right of parliament.

[Kiselev] Leonid Makarovich, the last thing I would like to ask you is how you regard the raising of the Russian Federation St. Andrew's flags on naval ships of the Black Sea Fleet? Is there any possibility, as people have been saying recently, of you meeting the president of Russia in the near future, in order to discuss the situation that has emerged?

[Kravchuk] I am in favor of such a meeting taking place, and as soon as possible, too.

As for my reaction to the hoisting of flags: you know, I think that any unilateral solution today—and the raising of flags is just such a solution—is a direct breach of the Yalta agreements. In the case at issue, the problem is further complicated by the fact that after a naval ship has raised the flag of another state, the crew and ship become ships of that other state. In the case at issue, ships of another state are appearing on our territory. I would like us to resolve this issue peacefully, in the interests of the Black Sea Fleet and in the interests of Sevastopol and of Ukraine and Russia as well. If there is the will, I think we could find such a solution, and Boris Nikolayevich and I must do that together. I understand that his diary is pretty full at present, but nevertheless the time must be found for us to meet and solve this problem, one very difficult for us.

[Kiselev] Thank you very much for your detailed replies, Leonid Makarovich. That was President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine on the line there.

[Kravchuk] (?Thank you to the listeners). I wish you success.

Russian Envoy Delivers Yeltsin Letter to Kravchuk

LD3105203193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2017 GMT 31 May 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Kiev June 1 TASS—Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk received on Monday [31 May] Russian Ambassador to Ukraine L. Smolyakov who extended a letter from Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

In his letter the Russian president expressed concern over the situation arisen in the Black Sea Fleet. He stressed that it is necessary to take urgent measures and in the near future to hold negotiations of foreign ministers of Ukraine and Russia to prepare the fothcoming summit meeting.

Kravchuk Talks to Brzezinski About Relations With Russia

LD3105173993 Kiev UKRINFORM in Russian 1527 GMT 31 May 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent]

[Text] Kiev 31 May—The most important problem is to establish civilized partnership relations with Russia, said Ukraine's President Leonid Kravchuk today, in conversation with Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of the Institute of Strategic Stidies in Washington. He noted that complications in the life of the Ukrainian state have increased. This has happened in only the few months which had elapsed since the first visit by Zbigniew Brzezinski to Ukraine.

Zbigniew Brzezinski agreed with the view of the president on the need to settle relations between Ukraine and the Russian Federation. The popular Western politician noted that in his view the establishment of Ukrainian-American relations will also facilitate the strengthening of Ukraine's relations with Russia.

Leonid Kravchuk and Zbigniew Brzezinski spent the remaining part of their conversation behind closed doors.

Zlenko: Yugoslav Sanctions Disrupting Shipping on Danube

LD2905090793 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0700 GMT 29 May 93

[Text] Attempts at broad interpretation and premature application by some states of clauses of the UN resolution regarding sanctions against Yugoslavia are undesirable, Ukraine Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko has stated. The minister emphasized that it is such actions, on the part of Romania in particular, that have led to the Ukrainian fleet on the Danube practically ceasing its activity. Over the course of a month 110 vessels of the fleet were detained in Romanian ports. According to the latest information, the minister said, Ukraine and Romania have nevertheless come to an understanding on this issue.

Losses Over $2.3 Billion

WS2805143493 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 0900 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Ukrainian Foreign Minister Anatoliy Zlenko has discussed with ambassadors of the Danube states the possibility of compensation for countries suffering losses through the observance of Security Council sanctions against the Republic of Yugoslavia. The minister told the representatives of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Austria, and the United States that Ukraine's direct losses have reached $2,356,400,000. While forecasting the development of events, Anatoliy Zlenko estimated that Ukraine's losses might hit the mark of another $1,537,000,000 by the end of 1993.

Talks End With Russia on Gas Deliveries, Payments, Loans

MK2805101493 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 28 May 93 p 10

[Alla Kovtun report: "Aleksandr Shokhin in Kiev. Russia, Ukraine Narrow Differences"]

[Text] At the talks between Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin and top members of the Ukrainian Government that ended in Kiev yesterday, the discussion of the key issues of economic collaboration between the two republics was not followed by the signing of any intergovernmental documents. This did not mean, however, that the talks yielded no results. First, the two sides came closer to each other on the key issues. Second, a number of cooperation agreements were signed in the areas of transportation and communications. KOMMERSANT-DAILY experts note that the chief result of the talks is the two sides' agreement to sign a free trade accord that is to come into force as early as this year.

Deliveries of Russian oil to Ukraine as well as the long-festering differences over splitting the assets and debts of the former USSR were not on the agenda of the meetings Aleksandr Shokhin held in Kiev. Nonetheless, a number of acute problems, such as prices of Russian gas and the settlement of bilateral payments, were discussed during the negotiations.

Obvious progress was made on the first issue, although the initial stances of the two sides differed substantially. Ukraine, drawing on Belarus' experience, insisted that 1,000 cubic meters of gas should cost 15,600 rubles [R]. Russia proposed R42,000. The gap of R27,000, according to the Russian side, resulted from differences in trade regimes. Ukraine is the only CIS country with which Russia has a most favored nation agreement, and not a free trade accord; hence, the prices of the goods to be delivered may not be lower than prices in trade with other countries enjoying the same status. So, the forward movement in resolving this problem means agreement to set up a free trade regime.

As for the questions of credits and payments, an agreement in principle was reached during the discussion that a government credit would be granted to Ukraine. Russian proposals provide for including the outstanding technical loans and also the amount of mutual payments into the total amount of the credit (R1.05 trillion). The credit is to be recalculated in U.S. dollars and repaid at the LIBOR [London Interbank Overnight Rate] rate plus 2.25 percent. The Ukrainian insurance deposit must be at least $5 million. The deadline for the credit's repayment is 1999. According to available reports, Ukraine accepted in principle the proposed model. At the same time, observers do not rule out that in the final version Ukraine's collateral may be paid not in hard- currency assets, but in stocks of enterprises, for the Russian side counts on purchasing some part of the stock of Ukraine's pipe- manufacturing plants.

Trade Accords Signed

WS2805132293 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1432 GMT 27 May 93

[Text] Kiev, 26 May—The meeting between the Ukrainian and Russian government delegations, headed respectively by Vasyl Yevtukhov, Ukrainian acting first deputy prime minister; and Aleksandr Shokhin, deputy chairman of the Russian Cabinet of Ministers, has concluded.

As the result of Ukrainian-Russian negotiations, the following agreements have been signed:

1. On mutual supplies of precious metals and diamonds as well as their by-products;

2. On jewelry diamond supplies for 1993;

3. On military and technical cooperation;

4. On cooperation in the field of communications;

5. On principles of cooperation and relations in the field of transportation.

It was agreed that a free trade treaty will soon be prepared. The price of Russian natural gas supplies to Ukraine has also been set. Both delegations plan to complete a draft agreement on state credits based on the 1992 results of the mutual trade and economic relations and on the terms of their extension in 1993.

Aleksandr Shokhin met with Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk and Ukrainian Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma.

Kiev To Pay Back $2.5 Billion Loan

WS2805140493 Kiev UNIAN in Ukrainian 0900 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Late at night on 26 May, First Deputy Prime Minister Vasyl Yevtukhov and Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin signed an agreement on a 1992 state loan based on the results of trade and economic relations. In accordance with this agreement, Ukraine will pay back over a period of seven years the credit granted by Russia in 1992. The sum of the credit (according to the dollar exchange rate against ruble at the moment of granting the loan) is $2.5 billion. The interest rate is "libre plus one." [as received]

National Affairs

Kravchuk Interviewed on Current Issues

LD3105182293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 30 May 93

[Interview with President Leonid Kravchuk by Ukraine Radio and Television commentator Ihor Storozhuk; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Storozhuk] Leonid Makarovych, you have just taken part in the Ostankino Itogi program and [words indistinct] (?we) can sum up some of the results of the Itogi interview. In my opinion the Moscow journalist paid much attention to Ukraine's internal problems. These certainly affect very strongly the situation concerning, let us say, relations between Ukraine and Russia.

[Kravchuk] Well, I think there is sense in this but, you see, it seems to me that the Russian audience would like to learn about objective processes in Ukraine, and I attempted to describe them as they are. Well, in the first place this concerns the questions that were asked. I think, therefore, it is good that the Russian viewer will be able to hear and see and to receive information from the president of Ukraine about the existing situation in Ukraine. This is normal and I think that such meetings, if they were held more often, maybe would promote better relations between Ukraine and Russia, because I can judge from certain sources of information that at the level of a rayon or a collective, Russians form an opinion that some extraordinary processes are taking place here in Ukraine, especially those Russians with a bias toward nationalism, and people were always being frightened by this [word indistinct]. Leaders of the state are, allegedly, also inclined to this; where can this lead to?

People are being frightened and our internal home-bred forces, again, add this to their armory and try all the time to frighten people: for instance, you see where they are leading and where they are going—to the renewal, to the revival, and our salvation—they say—is a renewal and revival of the same union and the same relations that existed before. However, nobody thinks about the fact that both this and that direction are dangerous, because, inevitably, if one takes a stand on the basis of these two extremes there is only one consequence—confrontation, because these are processes which cannot be settled between themselves, they are diametrically opposed. However, it is interesting, I look at some of our political figures on the right and on the left and they are saying the same—this is interesting.

[Storozhuk] [words indistinct] Leonid Makarovych, many questions from Moscow concerned some, let us say, important issues, the problems of our life—a fairly difficult life. What problem would you single out, of those questions, say, concerning parliamentary matters and the reciprocal action of various powers, as the most acute and the most important for us at present.

[Kravchuk] Well you know that in the mass media, both in our own and in that of Russia and the world, the most important thing discussed at present is the issue of power in Ukraine.

[Storozhuk] The issue of power.

[Kravchuk] By the way, again, this problem appeared due to the fact that things were not completely defined as far as power is concerned. Well, let us say, why did the problem with the Cabinet of Ministers suddenly arise? It would not exist if they had not been given powers or if they had been given them not for half a year but, say, for two years.

[Storozhuk] So that it would then be possible to...

[Kravchuk, interrupting] (?Yes, that is what I am saying.) There would not have been this problem in the government, in the Supreme Council, and now they want to create an impression that it is, allegedly, the president who created it. I would not have created anything—if the Cabinet of Ministers had received these powers for two years it would be working (?now). The term of their powers ended on 21 May. A problem arose whether or not to give powers to the Cabinet of Ministers. If they are not given them, you have one situation and if they are given, there is a different situation. I did not object to giving the powers after all. This...

[Storozhuk, interrupting] Well, yes.

[Kravchuk] Everyone heard this and all attempts to turn the discussion or, say, the situation in the parliament and around the parliament and in society to make it seem that the president is to blame—this is juggling with the facts. It was all obvious, nobody concealed anything. So the powers have expired, what next? The prime minister reasonably said that if he is not given powers he is resigning. A very complex situation arises—it is no less complex now—the resignation was not accepted, this is the right of the parliament but let us now have a look: Do the decrees work? Who can answer? What is in force, a decree or a law on one issue or another? Many decrees have been passed. Well, the first thing that has to be done is to give the interpretation of decrees and laws dealing with the same issues, that is, in the parliament, I think, one has to decide on what remains a legislative norm and what does not. Because at present neither the president nor the government has such powers. Both the laws and decrees are in force. This is the first task. The second one is to determine who is going to assume the responsibility for carrying out reforms, monetary and economic, all these reforms which are the main problem at present.

No matter what they would say, reforms are the main thing at present. If we continue arguing whether to follow one path or another and the reforms are at a standstill, nothing will move and everone can see that. Therefore, I proposed three variants, as I said to Ostankino: Either the government receives the powers or the president undertakes the direct management of the government and then heads, really logically heads (?in the center) the executive power.

These are the two possible variants. Why was I more inclined to the proposition as regards the president? Because our legislation at present is built proceeding from the fact that there is the president as the head of the executive power. Also, the executive structures are already created, starting from rayons to oblasts and so on. Again, they are created according to the principle that the president is the head of the executive power. Well, I thought that the president would become head of the government, and the power structures down there would not need to be changed, because there are hundreds of thousands of people there. It is simply unrealistic to think that it can be done easily if one starts making changes there; it is simply unrealistic. So before the adoption of the new constitution, this existing structure, remains and the president heads the executive power in order that one policy and one discipline, the reforms, the provision with everything that is only possible, the social protection and everything that is necessary for society will be carried out at all levels and on the entire vertical line [sentence as heard]. Changes to the constitution have to be made only as far as this is concerned.

They say the president wants to usurp the authority, that dictatorship is possible and so on. But if it were true, I would not go to parliament and prove that this must be done on the basis of the constitution. I don't want anyone to view me as if I act beyond the law and beyond the constitution. The parliament does take a decision. Well. It does not. This is its right. But I—if the parliament does not take a decision, again it has the right not to take a decision, and I do not have any claims against the parliament. It decided to act in a different manner. So, it does not take such a decision and assumes responsibility for the decision which it takes. This is a must: decision and responsibility. [passage omitted]

Here is the whole scheme. There is nothing special about it. The parliament adopts the laws which are compulsory for the president. Nothing is changed, is it? The parliament gets agreement on ministers with the parliament [as heard]. Nothing is changed, is it? Then, the parliament controls the executive power. Then, the parliament may express no confidence in the ministers. And all this remains as it is. Nothing is changed. The only thing that is changed is the fact that the president and vice president will not report to parliament every month, but the ministers can report. The president or vice premier or premier should not necessarily stand before parliament and report to the people all the time. [passage omitted]

One should understand that the situation is so complicated that the consolidation of the executive power is the only possible way out. We will adopt a new constitution. What kind of authority we will have depends on how the people will vote on the constitution and how the parliament will vote on the constitution. [passage omitted]

[Storozhuk] Could you try and forecast what will begin on Tuesday? What decisions will be made]? Or which way will it go?

[Kravchuk] You know, I would only like my opponents, and there will be opponents, of course, this is their right, both in parliament and outside parliament, to proceed from what I offered. And I offered three variants. But they accept only one variant, as if the president wants to usurp power. In other words, they want, they accuse me now, saying, what did I do it for? Do you understand? [passage omitted]

Everybody was talking about the necessity of discipline. True. It is necessary. Leonid Danylovych [Kuchma] said honestly that concentration of power is needed, and both Ivan Stepanovych [Plyushch] and myself confirmed this. Again, we confirmed something which the parliament and the people demanded all the time: discipline, well-organized work, order, crime prevention, progress of reforms, monetary reform, banking reform, changes in the banking structure, in the improvement of the finance and credit system itself, privatization, demonopolization, and (?corporation). The green light should be given to all this. From here down to a collective itself. Everybody appealed for this. When I said I would assume these plenary powers and would do everything to realize all this—the reform and all the rest—immediately some talk that was incomprehensible to me was started. Accusations were launched as if I was going to get something different from this. This evokes my concern. I would like all the three variants to be considered. It is my right to submit a proposal. And, I just consider it very trivial, simply trivial to accuse me of the fact that I exercised this right.

[Storozhuk] I know that one of the arguments, say, in favor of the necessity of such a concentration of power, and the need for the president to head the executive power structure, is the fact that you can help Ukraine find normal relations with Russia. At least, one can proceed from what took place in Belarus when the USSR period ended and the CIS period began. Now, when the Black Sea Fleet has problems with flags and other things, will it be in your way and in the way of Ukraine as a whole?

[Kravchuk] There is a complicated problem for relations between Ukraine and Russia—the Black Sea Fleet. We have to solve it together. I hope we will do this. Any reckless actions, or actions which urge people to one side, may lead to confrontation. We are talking about armed people, this is why here we must weigh our every move.

I proposed that Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] and myself should meet in the near future to solve this issue concerning the Black Sea Fleet, proceeding from the Yalta agreement. If we change some paragraphs of the agreement, it is our right to change them, after all, but we must provide and open a way to the solution of the Black Sea Fleet issue. By the way, the leadership of the Black Sea Fleet also demands that this should be done. It wants this situation to be cleared up. And we must do this.

As far as relations with Russia are concerned, I do not see relations other than relations of friendship and partnership. Both today and in the distant future. [passage omitted]

There is no other option and there will be none, believe me. In Ukraine, the people of Ukraine will not allow very nationalistically excited people to come to power, those who want the only thing—to be separated from Russia. These people, I would say, they are revolutionaries without mass support. They brandish swords but nobody stands behind them, just individuals. These people can be seen. Chauvinistically minded people will never come to power in Ukraine [word indistinct] those who will abide by the centrist stand will certainly come to power because this is the only way toward normal relations with Russia. [passage omitted]

Russia is moving toward another way of life, another relationship. If we slow down our processes here, then I ask the following question: The economy of Ukraine which is neither market nor socialist, which is some incomprehensible type—will it be able to engage in normal relations with the economy of Russia which will change its appearance and its production relations? [passage omitted]

Why did I say it is necessary to concentrate power in one person? So as to push forward reforms, to give them a fresh impetus, a second wind, to change what is necessary to change, both in legislation and through the Supreme Council, once again, through the decrees of the president where I can do something. But the primary task today is to give an impetus to the reforms.

[Storozhuk] Do you think a referendum here on whether or not people want such reforms and whether they want to move to the market will not be necessary? Life has become more difficult...

[Kravchuk, interrupting] You see the referendum in Russia did not concern this issue.

[Storozhuk] [words indistinct]

[Kravchuk] And when relations between the executive and legislative powers became aggravated then some questions, let us say, were added to this ballot paper. At the beginning there was one question, right? You know I treat these referenda with respect, certainly, but one should not overindulge in them either. Because, first, they greatly politicize society; second, after all they require a colossal expenditure of labor; and third, those people who now have to manage the economy and be directly working somewhere in collectives, maybe, helping with something in the agrarian sector and with other things—they will only be engaged in speeches and rallies.

This is something we do not need at present. We have determined our society in principle as a democratic, law-abiding, and civilized society. These factors are written down in the Act of Independence. The voting was already done—92 percent of the electorate voted for them. They say we thought things would be better. To be honest, I also thought things would be better. But it does not depend solely on us. Look what they did with fuels; the prices for fuels were increased a thousand-fold, a thousand-fold. There are discussions around this again that they are, allegedly, expensive only for Ukraine. Ivan Stepanovych [Plyushch] said at the congress of collective farms, and I said several times, that Russia sells at the same price to everyone, to Belarus, to Ukraine, and to Kazakhstan. It is impossible that a country would sell something at one price to one country and at a different price to another. Everything is exacerbated to show that we are, as they say, so unapproachable that there is such a bad attitude to us. The attitude to us is the same as it is to others, trust me.

Our relations with Russia, and I stress this, these relations are the determining ones. Nobody should forget this—no matter who would come to power after us—for them relations with Russia are the alpha and omega. Certainly we should not forget our relations with other countries, with European countries and so on, but not to the detriment of these relations with Russia. It cannot be—it has to be an equal partnership, friendship and equal partnership. It has been determined for us: Here is the globe and here is the border of thousands of kilometers and here is a large and formidable neighbor, and we have to take this into account and live in peace and have normal relations with him.

By the way, if everyone wanted it and did not create some sort of a negative field here and there—both Boris Nikolayevich and [words indistinct] understand that there is no other way. We only need to take this understanding to the level of some normal legislative relations, to relations on the basis of agreements and to fulfill what you wrote. Everything will be settled by all means. There can be nothing else.

[Storozhuk] (?Let us) hope that your participation in the Itogi program helped this.

[Kravchuk] I also think that it is important for these meetings to take place, and not only with the president but with other leaders from Ukraine. We need to describe the real situation. I do not intend to say something which does not exist in reality; even if I know that there is something (?here) I would not say it. But if I know that something exists I try to deliver it in such a packaging that if would be understandable and would not require any other commentaries.

[Storozhuk] Thank you, Leonid Makarovych, for agreeing to tell us today about the situation in Ukraine and about everything else. Thank you.

Kravchuk Comments on Reforms, Plans

AU0106101093 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 27 May 93 p 2

[Interview with President Leonid Kravchuk by Volodymyr Skachko in Kiev; date not given: "The Plans of the President Are the Plans of the People!"]

[Text] Commenting upon the situation that has taken shape within the top echelons of the Ukrainian administration, L. Kravchuk pointed out: It is unlikely that, even with an ideal president, parliament, and government, it would be possible to do more. "The only thing that we could do under those conditions is to not engage in disputes in the parliament, but to realize that today, it is necessary to concentrate power and to establish an elementary order in the state. Unless we have all of these, there exist certain doubts as to our possibilities," concluded the president.

Then Leonid Kravchuk told our correspondent about his further plans under new conditions.

[Kravchuk] I am creating a group of specialists who will study two problems. The first problem is to ensure the continuity of the reforms. Second, to elaborate edicts that are necessary for pushing the reforms in those spheres where there is no certainty.

There is also a third problem—how to coordinate laws and those decrees that have already been issued. Otherwise, it is difficult to rely upon a single legal sphere.

[Skachko] What are your predictions for the reforms: Will they succeed or are we facing a catastrophe?

[Kravchuk] Proper conditions and willingness on the part of everybody are necessary for reforms to succeed. For example, we have certain laws at the level of the parliament and of the government, but just go down, and major problems start: The council wants one thing, the administration something else, the village council also something different, and the collective farm chairman something entirely different. Everybody has his own point of view. There is nothing bad about this, but when these points of view hinder reforms, this is already bad.

[Skachko] In other words, the reforms are doomed?

[Kravchuk] Why doomed? We will conduct reforms.

[Skachko] Will you be allowed to adjust the existing legislative foundation for conducting reforms?

[Kravchuk] Allowed or not allowed—this is one thing. What I am going to do is another thing. I do not think that when my edicts or the government's decrees finally conform to the interests of the people, this will have a great significance—whether I am allowed or not allowed. The main thing is for this to be supported by the people and to be supported by collectives of plants and factories. Then everything will go ahead.

[Skachko] Are you ready to appeal to the people for support?

[Kravchuk] I am not going to appeal to the people and incite them to a confrontation. When I spoke about appealing to the people—I want to stress this—I only wanted to explain the situation that had taken shape, to specify who is responsible for what actions, and to ask the people to support one decision or another. If the Supreme Council takes everything upon itself, I will support it. Because I want to proceed from a legal foundation. If the Supreme Council grants powers to the president and introduces corresponding acts into the Constitution, then I will act accordingly and will take the responsibility upon myself. If there is any other legitimate decision, with corresponding changes to the Constitution, I will support it. I am most decisively against partisan actions. We need a legislative foundation and a respect for the law.

[Skachko] In other words, there is no talk about a referendum on the confidence in the Supreme Council?

[Kravchuk] Not at all.

Supreme Council Debates Draft Military Doctrine

WS3105075893 Kiev UNIAR in Ukrainian 1424 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Kiev, 27 May—UNIAR has received documents on the debates of the Ukrainian Supreme Council commission on military issues and state security devoted to drafting the Ukrainian military doctrine.

President Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine has submitted a draft on military doctrine to the Supreme Council which says in its preamble that Ukraine is not a potential enemy to any specific country, and does not consider any specific state to be one. General Volodymyr Tolubko from Mykolayiv proposed that this portion be removed from the bill. Volodymyr Moskovka, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Oleksandr Piskun, and Larysa Skoryk proposed to delete the the passage which states: "does not consider any specific state to be one." Oleksandr Moroz, leader of the Ukrainian Socialists, insisted that a potential enemy be defined. Finally, the commission decided to exclude this passage from the preamble and include it in part 1.2 of the document—"Sources and Nature of Military Threat and Military Danger." An option prevailed, advocated by Ukrainian Defense Minister Oleksandr Morozov, that Ukraine will consider as a potential enemy a state whose consistent policies pose a military threat to Ukraine, interfere with Ukrainian internal affairs, and encroach upon its territorial integrity and national interests.

The provisions of the president's draft stating that Ukraine will comply with nonnuclear principles—not to accept, manufacture, or purchase nuclear weapons—provoke heated debates. The commission turned down a provision proposed by Larysa Skoryk which considered nuclear weapons as a security guarantee. It partially accepted a suggestion by Oleksandr Moroz that the draft doctrine envision the gradual mutual destruction of nuclear weapons. Bohdan Horyn came up with the following passage, also accepted in part: "Due to the present circumstances, Ukraine has become de jure and de facto a nuclear state, which according to the previously declared intentions, strives to become a nonnuclear state in the future, provide that it receives security guarantees and compensation for the physical value [vartist fizychna]. The commission approved the following wording of part 1.3 ("Attitude of Ukraine Toward Nuclear and Other Mass Destruction Weapons"): Having become an owner of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons due to historically conditioned reasons inherited from the former USSR, Ukraine will never sanction their utilization, and abandons the threat of this utilization in its foreign policy. Ukraine is intent on becoming a nonnuclear state in the future."

It was proposed that the draft military doctrine be discussed at an open session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, since it is not a classified document.

Industrialists Want Kuchma, Ministers To Manage Economy

LD3005102393 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0700 GMT 30 May 93

[Text] Both the domestic and foreign policy of Ukraine in the current situation of crisis should depend first and foremost upon the process of reforming the economy. This is only possible with the government's support of national industry and entrepreneurship.

This is stated in an appeal, published by the mass media, to the president, the Supreme Council chairman, and the prime minister by the Ukrainian Union of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs.

It proposes that the duplication of executive power should be excluded after relevant changes are made in the Constitution and that the full plenary powers in managing the economy should be granted to the Cabinet of Ministers, headed by Leonid Kuchma.

Pynzenyk Warns of Soaring Prices, Urges 'Strong Shock'

LD2905214293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1612 GMT 29 May 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent Galina Nekrasova]

[Text] Lvov, 29 May—Prices will soar in Ukraine as the country moves to settling payments for gas and oil to Russia at world prices, stated Viktor Pynzenyk, deputy prime minister of Ukraine's Cabinet of Ministers, today addressing a convention of entrepreneurs in Lvov.

"It is better for people to go through one strong shock than through years of torment," he stated. Fuels determine prices, both at home and externally, and this "may deal a severe blow to the economy as a whole, and even bring about its de-industrialization."

Viktor Pynzenyk went on to say that in June the government would simply not have enough coupons to make payments to the citizens. One way of resolving the problem of shortage of means of payment is to raise prices. However, if the parliament has its way and raises the minimum wage in June, then it will "gladden" the people by a 500 percent increase in prices instead of the expected 270 percent.

On the issue of the hard currency crisis, the deputy prime minister stated that "Ukraine owes Russia $2.5 billion for the last year, and the demand in rubles is not decreasing." The deputy prime minister tried to dispel the illusions of entrepreneurs, especially of those in eastern Ukraine, saying that the situation in the country would not be improved by Ukraine joining any economic alliances. The political side of this problem is such that "Ukraine would have to concede part of its sovereignty if it handed over the power functions of managing the economy to the center." But even if Ukraine is readmitted to the ruble zone, there will be no free circulation of funds, he believes. According to Viktor Pynzenyk, "hopes that one will be able to buy enough fuel to meet the demand are ephemeral."

Speaking of the division of the executive and legislative branches of power, the deputy prime minister maintained that "the diarchy is holding up many government decrees, including those on privatization." "Whatever changes may take place in the structure of the executive, whether the Leonid Kuchma government resigns or stays on, Ukraine's economy urgently needs a surgical operation. Procrastination may lead to a social explosion," he said.

Belarus

Shushkevich Interviewed on Results of Romanian Visit

WS3105104093 Minsk ZVYAZDA in Belarusian 11 May 93 p 1

[Interview with Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich by correspondent Valyantsin Zhdanko aboard a plane en route from Minsk to Bucharest on 7 May: "Poland, China, Romania...Was It an Unintentional or Conscious Choice of Political Priorities by Belarusian Politicians?"]

[Text] [Zhdanko] President Iliescu spoke about Romania's desire to join NATO. Did he express his opinion on Belarus joining the CIS security treaty?

[Shushkevich] No, we did not touch on the subject.

[Zhdanko] In Romania, they did away with collective farming very resolutely. Can you use their experience for the reorganization of our agriculture?

[Shushkevich] I have not drawn any conclusions yet—just a reason to think things over. They have destroyed kolkhozes and sovkhozes. This is bad. Certainly, they have inflicted losses on their agriculture. We are now flying over Romania and do not see the land divided into small plots. Why? Because the people have united to use agricultural technique jointly. They have themselves created a new social structure without enslavement. As a result, we do not doubt that as soon as the land is sown, the harvest will be gathered.

We do not know the details very well, so I would not yet praise their system of economy. However, their government does not provide for the spring planting, and does not bother with subsidies for farmers. As for us, we have not taken the European experience into consideration. In the European Community, the quota of state subsidies for agriculture constitutes parts of a percent, or as an exception, about 1 percent of the gross national income. Even the smaller part is allocated in the U.S.A. Our subsidies are considerably more. Even so, we can hear angry voices saying: You do not invest in Belarusian agriculture! We must give a chance to our villagers to develop independently. We should not hold back their initiative. Finally, this is the concern of the experts. This year, the planting campaign is over; therefore, changes can only be introduced for next year.

[Zhdanko] Did you talk about the role of Belarus and the CIS in regulating the Transdniester conflict?

[Shushkevich] No, we did not discuss this issue. What I would like to stress is that we adhere strictly to the Helsinki agreement and the Paris Charter. Therefore, it would have been improper to discuss bilateral relations between Romania and Moldova.

[Zhdanko] Some time ago, a lot was said about the intermediary role of Belarus in this conflict.

[Shushkevich] In my opinion, we cannot be mediators in this conflict. The reason is that our representatives have not thoroughly familiarized themselves with all the details of this antagonism. However, if both parties—Romania and Moldova—ask us to become involved in the matter, we will be ready.

I am sure that this issue will be resolved eventually. It cannot be fixed in an instant. You know what a long time we spent weighing the decision not to impose territorial demands on our neighbors. A lot of time has passed, and one has to look for the new ways of settling these controversial problems.

[Zhdanko] Belarus concluded an agreement on friendly relations and cooperation with Romania after having signed identical agreements with Poland and China. Did you choose these states consciously or by chance?

[Shushkevich] Let us not compare these cases. China? We can sell them our goods and buy something else instead. Our policy with China must eventually be developed. In any case, we can sell China many goods that are not in demand on the domestic market.

With Romania, both the amount of trade and the list of goods are different. Nevertheless, economic issues play a decisive role in our relations.

There is one more aspect. Do you remember how many anecdotes you know about Romania? Anecdotes about Belarus are also popular in Europe. We are in a similar situation. We must think together how to bridge this information gap. We unable to properly publicize the current changes in the Republic. Someone could have information about Belarus of an opposite, negataive character.

I was mistaken about Romania. I could not imagine its deep historic roots and ancient history. We must develop our contacts and break through the current information gap.

Our relations with Romania will stimulate the development of our relations with other countries. Thus, we have no political priorities, but there are definite similarities on some issues.

[Zhdanko] Did you talk about a Belarusian Embassy in Romania?

[Shushkevich] Yes, we did. The Romanian side is interested in it, just as we are. But there is the financial side of the matter. In the first place, we would have to spend a lot to open the embassy. It is up to the Defense Ministry to plan for an embassy, and it is up to the Supreme Soviet to take its recommendation into account. It is unfortunate, but we have made mistakes in this area. We have opened some legations and embassies that have more of a cultural nature than an economic one.

Article Views Arms Supply to Tajikistan

WS3105123693 Minsk ZVYAZDA in Belarusian 13 May 93 p 1

[Article by newspaper correspondent Valyantsin Zhdanko: "Belarus Delivers Arms to Tajikistan: On Credit or As a Present?"]

[Text] Supporters of the CIS military union state that the Belarusian Army will lose its fighting capability and be unable to perform its duties because the Republic does not produce arms. From the Supreme Soviet tribunals, high-ranking government officials have convinced the deputies that it is imperative that Belarus join the CIS collective security system, that otherwise Belarusian servicemen will lack pistol cartridges, and that military equipment will lack spare parts....

At the same time, in discussing the Belarus arms trade, our military always trys to explain that this is a forced and temporary measure that accounts for 55 percent of the maintenance budget for the Belarusian Army. Gennadiy Danilov, chief of the Department at the Council of Ministers, in his April interview to INTERFAX agency, remarked: "Belarus does not sell weapons to the countries where military actions are taking place. In keeping with this rule, we have had to refuse arms shipments to Armenia and Tajikistan."

This ban was in force for quite a short time. Last week, Abdumalik Abdulazhanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Tajikistan, in an interview with INTERFAX, said that Belarus, along with Russia and Uzbekistan, is "the key arms supplier" for his country. The division of labor is like this: Russia delivers armored vehicles and tanks, while Belarus provides arms and ammunition.

Why did Belarus shirk the declared principle? Maybe because the Army will get the billions it needs? This is unlikely to happen, because the military shipments are being conducted "partly on a free basis and partly on credit."

In mid-May, in order to promote Belarusian-Tajik military cooperation, a Belarusian Government will pay an official visit to Dushanbe and sign several documents, some of which will address military aid to Tajikistan. According to Abdumalik Abdulazhanov, Minsk will deliver weapons partly as a free aid and partly on credit.

Belarus has not yet become a member of the CIS military union but, in my opinion, the government believes that it has a free hand in this sphere. Belarusian arms shipments are heading south. The state receives either gratitude or vague credit obligations from the unstable Dushanbe regime. Meanwhile, the Belarusian military lament the lack of arms and ammunition for the Belarusian Armed Forces.

Witnessing all this, the Supreme Soviet majority and certain governmental circles draw the conclusion that "we will not survive without the collective security union." Their assumption is very logical.

Trade, Economic Agreements Signed With Switzerland

LD2805201893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1908 GMT 28 May 93

[By BELINFORM correspondent Viktor Kuklov for TASS]

[Text] Minsk May 28 TASS—A two-day Belarusian visit of a Swiss delegation, invited to the republic by Belarusian Prime Minister Vyacheslav Kebich, resulted in signing of intergovernmental agreements on trade and economic cooperation, mutual most favored nation regime and protection of investments.

The documents were signed by head of the Swiss national economy department Jean-Pascal Delamuraz and Deputy Belarusian Prime Minister Nikolay Kostikov.

Belarus has become a first CIS state, with which Switzerland has decided to establish close cooperation in various spheres, said Delamuraz. The agreements outline only general provisions of bilateral relations. The documents need specification.

"The agreements enable the development of cooperation on all structures we have in Belarus," Kostikov noted, in his turn, "these include machine-building, the chemical, oil-processing and light industries, and agriculture. There are huge prospects for cooperation in health care. Switzerland holds the third place in Belarusian exports and barter deals."

In the opinion of Swiss businessmen, information exchange should be improved to enable further successful cooperation and its expansion. In July, 1993, a Swiss governmental delegation will come to the republic to consider guarantees of credit and loan issuance, as well as study possibilities to insure the investors, who wish to finance the development of mixed productions in Belarus.

Kazakhstan

U.S. Delegation Finds 'No Serious Violations' of START I

LD3005091793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0854 GMT 31 May 93

[By KAZTAG correspondent Arkadiy Rostmistrovksiy for TASS]

[Text] Almaty May 31 TASS—A U.S. inspection for monitoring the implementation of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-1) continues its visit to Kazakhstan. General Robert Parker, head of the U.S. Government agency for inspection of the implementation of the START-1 Treaty, addressed a news conference held in the U.S. embassy in Kazakhstan, saying that contacts and talks the U.S. inspection team had in Kazakhstan, were fruitful and encouraging.

The delegation had talks with the Kazakh State Adviser Kairbek Suleymenov, Defence Minister Sagadat Nurmagambetov and Deputy Foreign Minister Kasymzhumart Tokayev.

The U.S. general said that in all probability, the hopes pinned by the governments of the two countries on the U.S. delegation resolving all problems concerning the START-1 Treaty, would be realised. The U.S. general reminded of the fact that the Kazakh Parliament was the first among parliaments of CIS countries, deploying nuclear weapons on their territory, to ratify the START-1 Treaty.

Parker told journalists that no serious violations of the treaty had been found out during the inspection.

Foreign Minister Meets Danish Economic Minister

LD0106102793 Almaty Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 2300 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Tuleutay Suleymenov, minister of foreign affairs of Kazakhstan received Helle Degn, economic minister of the Kingdom of Denmark, yesterday. Issues related to nuclear weapons deployed on the territory of the republic were touched upon. Suleymenov confirmed the consistent and unchangeable character of the course of Kazakhstan toward the implementation of the undertaken pledges as far as the first Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty and the Lisbon 1992 protocols are concerned. Special attention was paid to the prospects of bilateral economic cooperation. It was underlined that Denmark, being the EEC chairing state, could have significantly contributed to a more dynamic development of connections between the EEC and Kazakhstan. Helle Degn imparted that the Danish Government has set up a special investment fund for Central and East Europe including Kazakhstan. She stated that she supports the idea of developing direct partnership ties between the two countries' industries. Henrik Ree Iversen, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of Denmark to Kazakhstan participated in the talks.

Tereshchenko Tours West, Departs for Moscow 31 May

LD0106083593 Almaty Kazakh Radio Network in Kazakh 2300 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Prime Minister Sergey Tereshchenko arrived in Atyrau last Sunday [30 May]. He was accompanied by a number of ministers and members of the extraordinary governmental commission for the elimination of the flooding's aftermaths. Head of the government inspected the flooded coasts of the Caspian Sea. In the oblast center of Atyrau Sergey Tereshchenko visited an oil processing plant where he expressed interest to the process of remodelling and expanding the main sectors of the enterprise. In the morning of 31 May the prime minister left for the Kulsary settlement in Emba [Embinski] Rayon by plane. He visited the settlement Zhana Karaton built by the Kazakhstani-Czechoslovakian joint venture Kazpromstavba. On Monday Sergey Tereshchenko left Atyrau for Moscow.

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Comments on Russia's Role in Caucasian 'War'

TA2805145593 Tel Aviv DAVAR (DVAR HASHAVU'A supplement) in Hebrew 28 May 93 pp 4, 5, 6

[Report on interview with President Abulfaz Elchibey by Pazit Rabina at the presidential palace in Baku "at the beginning of May"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] In Baku it is said that President Elchibey is barely in control and that his coalition is hanging by a thread. There is no room for gentle professors at the top of the Azerbaijani leadership. In an interview at the presidential palace at the beginning of May, however, the president reveals himself to be a man whose sharp tongue is at odds with his immaculate manners and quiet tone of voice.

"To my great regret," Elchibey says, "the war between Armenia and Azerbaijan long ago ceased to be a war between two rivals from the Caucasus. This is a war in which the combating peoples have become the pawns of mightier powers. Russia is stirring up a war in the Caucasus," Elchibey asserts. "Looking back," Elchibey says, "we can enumerate one by one the Russian military officers and KGB personnel who were actively responsible for bringing about the deterioration in the situation. People who once operated within the framework of the Soviet state are now acting as part of the Russian republic and raking in huge profits by selling weapons to the areas of fighting in the Caucasus. Elchibey claims that "the recent Armenian victories in the war can be chalked up to the presence of the Russian 7th Army, which is stationed in the region and is helping the Armenians in their struggle. Russia has a vested interest in the continuation of the war," the president said, noting that "the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan gives the Russians a foothold in the Caucasus."

Elchibey averred that the very week of our talk there had been an indisputable example of Russia's role in fanning the fires of war in the region: Six Russian soldiers, who were taken captive after bloody battles in the Kelbadzhar area, were brought to trial before a military court in Baku. The six Russians were accused of slaughtering 33 Azeris with axes and blunt instruments. In addition to murder, they were also accused of planting explosive charges, attempted kidnappings, and terrorist attacks against the local population. From the beginning of the week, rumor had it that the six Russians would be executed. No meaningful attempts to save them were made. Since the soldiers's capture, the Russian Government has disclaimed any responsibility toward them, claiming that they were mercenaries, not soldiers. But the six Russians testified that they belonged to Russia's 7th Army stationed in Armenia. Last week it was officially reported that the six men have been sentenced to death. All the attempts to swap them for six Azeri prisoners have so far been unsuccessful. If the soldiers are executed, it will be the first time in the post-Soviet era that any country dares to execute Russian soldiers. It is hard to predict the consequences, but anything is possible in the Caucasus.

To counter the existing Russian presence in the Caucasus, Elchibey is planning to form a small, efficient, and modern Azerbaijani Army. "Yes, he says, "we are planning a new army that will be based on weapons from Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States."

Elchibey is full of praise for Western style capitalism: "I thank the American oil companies, Amoco, and the British oil firm British Petroleum for their extensive investments in the entire region and especially in Azerbaijan."

A group of Pakistani pilots, navigators, and airmen, wearing their flight suits and carrying their instruction manuals, were photographed a day before the interview with the president. In response to an indirect question about Pakistan, a fellow Islamic state and potential ally that could help Azerbaijan build up its Air Force, the president reiterated that he prefers the British, Turks, and Americans. He is right to a great extent. After all, United States built up Pakistan's Air Force, and the corps structure, not to mention the ranks and uniforms of the Pakistani Army, are a legacy of British colonialism. The initials of the Pakistan Air Force, which are emblazoned on the center of the wings stitched to the pilots' flight suits, are an accurate replica of the British Royal Air Force's logo.

The building of a modern army is the dream of every military industry. The state of war in Azerbaijan offers such an opportunity. The creation of an entire army from scratch would be a veritable gold mine for the economy of a country like Israel, or even the United States, for many years. Therefore, and this is only stating the obvious, many are showing interest, including Israel.

President Elchibey preferred to elegantly avoid the question of why Azerbaijan should not make use of the good services of the State of Israel. However, sources in Azerbaijan and Geneva this week confirmed that night-vision equipment for aircraft had been found in the areas of fighting in Nagorno-Karabakh. The equipment was taken from Turkish helicopters that had crashed in the region. The assessment is that these are Israeli systems or components to enable helicopters to fly over wadis and streams under very difficult flying conditions and to fly close to enemy troop concentrations and carry out commando attacks. Wafa Golodza, the president's close adviser on international affairs, sits two floors below Elchibey's office. [passage omitted]

Like the president, Golodza does not mince words. Referring to Arkadiy Volskiy, the man appointed by Mikhail Gorbachev to mediate between the warring parties in Nagorno-Karabakh, he says: "He is a filthy man." [passage omitted]

When asked about sales of Israeli arms, presidential adviser Golodza denied the reports. "I never met David Kimche [former Israeli Foreign Ministry and Mosad official]. But Golodza has met other Israelis. Last year Golodza conducted a secret visit to Israel. News of his visit leaked, however, and was published by Armenian journalists in France. In Israel, Golodza says, he met with Foreign Minister Shim'on Peres and proposed cultural and scientific exchanges. "You are leaving a vacuum for Islamic fundamentalism in the region," was Golodza's friendly warning. "We need more student exchanges between universities," he said. Peres, Golodza said, agreed with every word. [passage omitted]

Kamberov Notes Need To 'Win' U.S. Interest

NC2805132593 Baku TURAN in English 0900 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Baku May 28 (TURAN)—The chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan in his interview to the 'Zerkalo' newspaper noted, that Azerbaijan had to win the interests of the USA over to its side.

'Natural resources, first of all oil, could shorten our way to the heart of America', noted the speaker of the parliament. According to his opinion, that could let Azerbaijan enter the sphere of the USA interests. At the same time I. Kamberov said that natural resources, geographical position gave Azerbaijan advantage, in comparison with its neighbours. American foreign policy in the region could be balanced with the help of these advantages.

Together with this, he noted, 'we must try to balance the interests of West and East in the Caucasus. Only this chance can be a real basis for peace.'

Russian Airborne Division Leaves Gyandzha

OW3105121993 Baku Azerbaycan Radio Televiziyasi Television Network in Russian 1500 GMT 28 May 93

[From the "Telefaks" newscast]

[Text] Isa Kamberov read a letter sent to the national assembly by General Shcherbak, commander of a division of airborne troops deployed in the city of Gyandzha, at a session held on 26 May. The letter expresses deep gratitude for assistance in the unhindered withdrawal of troops under the general's command to Russia. The letter also expresses the hope that the senseless war between Armenia and Azerbaijan would stop presently, and that Azerbaijan would become a state powerful in every aspect.

General Shcherbak left for his motherland on 25 May. He was the last of his division to do so.

Russia Said Unable To Provide Credit

NC0106090393 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Because the Russian Finance Ministry is short of funds, the Russian Federation will not be able to provide a credit of 5 billion rubles to Azerbaijan.

According to the official [word indistinct], Azerbaijan considered its needs and not Russia's resources when it asked for the credit. A KHABER SERVICE NEWS AGENCY correspondent has been informed by the Azerbaijan representative's office in Moscow that right now, Russia can only allocate 9 billion rubles to the former USSR republics in the form of credit. The needs of the former republics, however, is more than 10 times that amount. Nevertheless, Azerbaijan's representatives have been informed that the Russian Government can allocate 5 billion rubles in credit to Azerbaijan. [sentence as heard]

Several economic experts believe that the problem can be resolved by increasing the volume of exports to Russia and [words indistinct].

Georgia

Abkhazia, S. Ossetia Appeal to Yeltsin To Delay Treaty

LD2905114393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1051 GMT 29 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS—Heads of the Abkhazian and South Ossetian parliaments, Vladislav Ardzinba and Torez Kulumbekov, have appealed to Russian President Boris Yeltsin on Saturday [29 May] to delay signing a treaty on friendship and cooperation with Georgia until a comprehensive settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia and South Ossetia is achieved.

A joint statement to this effect says that "Abkhazia and South Ossetia can no longer remain a part of Georgia, which is unable to act as a guarantor of rights of the people of our republics."

Ardzinba and Kulumbekov expressed concern about "the continuing supplies of weapons, ammunition and military hardware from Russia to Georgia." "We are more concerned about Russo-Georgian talks, at which the Georgian leadership is attempting to decide the fates of Abkhazia and South Ossetia behind our back," the statement said.

The Abkhazian Defence Ministry reported on Saturday that there had been violations of the ceasefire agreement in the zone of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. Positional fighting continues in the Ochamchir region. Georgian troops are shelling the Abkhazian villages of Labra and Chaarkyt from grenade launchers and large- calibre machine guns. The Georgian Army is concentrating manpower and military hardware in the vicinity of the village of Media.

Shevardnadze Envoy Criticizes Appeal

LD3005181893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1715 GMT 30 May 93

[Report by GIA-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tbilisi, 30 May—Aleksandr Kavsadze, extraordinary and plenipotentiary representative of the Georgian head of state and chairman of the state committee for inter-ethnic relations and protection of human rights, has declared that "the situation could deteriorate," following the appeal to the Russian president from the leaders of the parliaments of Abkhazia and South Ossetia opposing the signing of a treaty of friendship and cooperation between Russia and Georgia until the conflicts in Abkhazia and South Ossetia are settled.

Kavsadze's statement, circulated today, notes that "Georgia has embarked firmly on the path of democratic development and will do everything to defend people's rights and their prosperity." At the same time, it reiterates "the determination of the Georgian people not to accept the violation of their country's territorial integrity."

Shevardnadze Issues Decree on Armed Forces

LD2805155793 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1507 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] A decree of E. Shevardnadze, the head of state and chairman of the Parliament of Georgia, on working out and implementing a program of military construction for the Republic of Georgia was published in the republican press today. The preamble to this decree states that the creation of a single, well-armed army is a task of the utmost importance for the state in which every citizen of the republic, indeed the entire nation, should actively participate.

The Defense Ministry of the Republic of Georgia, together with the command of the republic's Armed Forces should, over a period of 10 days, work out and present for amendment by the Georgian head of state and the commander of the armed forces a draft military doctrine and a program for the military construction of the Georgian Armed Forces.

The abovementioned draft should correspond to the national interests of the Republic of Georgia and should fully comply with all the requirements made of it in accordance with international agreements as a member state of the United Nations and the CSCE.

Shevardnadze, Officials Attend 'Mkhedrioni' Meeting

LD2805165293 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 1300 GMT 28 May 93

[Text] Today, at the Palace of Chess, a meeting of Mkhedrioni members was held. At the meeting, Jaba Ioseliani said that before the parliament session he had talks with Eduard Shevardnadze, the chairman of the parliament and head of state. Jaba Ioseliani also said that he will establish a parallel commission that will draw up concrete demands.

It was emphasized at the meeting that despite the fact that fighting has stopped in Abkhazia, a unit of Mkhedrioni will go to Abkhazia anyway so that the Gagra tragedy will not recur.

Georgian head of state Eduard Shevardnadze, Supreme Soviet Speaker Vakhtang Goguadze, Tbilisi Mayor Kote Gabashvili, Interior Minister Teimuraz Khachishvili, and other officials were present at the meeting.

Eduard Shevardnadze said that parliament's resolution on the organization of Mkhedrioni must be implemented. The unit must be established within the system of the Defense and Interior Ministries. The head of state answered questions from Mkhedrioni members. Tbilisi Mayor Kote Gabashvili made a speech at the meeting.

Shevardnadze Says Compromise Reached

LD3105165493 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1104 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] [No dateline as reached] Mr. E. Shevardnadze, head of state and chairman of parliament of the Republic of Georgia, said in his traditional radio interview today that Russo-Georgian relations remain an important factor in the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia. All conditions for the start of talks are now in place. A cease-fire has been announced to determine the future of the country. Later, the head of state spoke about the UN's role in the settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia and the Georgian Army's functions in the conflict.

Speaking about granting the Mkhedrioni paramilitary group the rescue corps status, E. Shevardnadze said the government arrived at a decision which was acceptable for Mkhedrioni representatives, parliament, and the general public. After this, the recent visit to Georgia by the Iranian foreign minister was discussed. The head of state spoke positively about the visit saying he is in favor of lasting and comprehensive relations between Georgia and Iran.

E. Shevardnadze devoted much of his address to economic problems and the introduction of a national currency in the republic. He said the government will assist in settling all problems. In conclusion, the Georgian head of state spoke about his forthcoming visit to Central Asia and China. He stressed the importance of this visit saying that it would promote good relations between Georgia and that region.

Reports on Ukrainian Mercenaries Denied

LD3005144193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1155 GMT 30 May 93

[By GIA correspondent for TASS]

[Text] Tbilisi, 30 May—The press secretariat of the head of state of the Republic of Georgia has issued a statement denying a number of mass media reports that mercenaries have arrived in Abkhazia from Western Ukraine and are allegedly taking part in fighting on the side of the Georgian troops. The reports are described in the press secretariat release as being "without foundation."

Abkhazia Denies Meeting With Karkarashvili

LD3105130493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1236 GMT 31 May 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Roman Zadunayskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The Abkhazian Defence Ministry denied reports of Georgian mass media that defence ministers of Abkhazia and Georgia, Sultan Sosnaliyev and Georgiy Karkarashvili, are going to meet.

The reports "are groundless", according to a Defence Ministry statement received by TASS from the press service of the Abkhazian Parliament on Monday.

The statement also said that armed units from western Georgia (Mingrelia) are not participating in the conflict on the Georgian side, as it was agreed between Sosnaliyev and commander of the units Loti Kobalia in Gudauta.

Shevardnadze Receives Letter From Turkey's Demirel

LD3105080593 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0200 GMT 31 May 93

[Text] Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian parliament and head of state, has received a letter from Turkey saying:

Your Excellency, let me thank you for the sincere congratulations and kind regards you sent me following my election as president of Turkey.

We attach a great deal of importance to friendly and good- neighborly relations in all spheres between Turkey and Georgia. There is no doubt that these relations, which our people share, will contribute greatly toward establishing peace, stability, and regional cooperation in the Caucasus and the Black Sea region.

I follow closely and support your efforts directed toward building a modern state based on the principles of democracy in friendly Georgia.

I would like to take this opportunity to send my sincere regards to the friendly Georgian people. I would also like to say that the warm memories of my visit to your beautiful country last year are still alive.

Let me, once again, with deep respect for you, express the hope that Your Excellency's forthcoming visit to my country in the near future will once again strengthen the existing good relations between our countries and peoples.

[signed] Suleyman Demirel, president of the Republic of Turkey